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## Framework Long

Epistemology comes before all other ethical foundations because labeling things moral or immoral is just a function of our knowledge. We need to know *how* we know what right and wrong are before we can pick the best definition. **And**, a priori reasoning is impossible so the only epistemologically sound basis for Morality is experience. **Schwartz**[[1]](#footnote-1)

The empirical support for the fundamental principle of empiricism is diffuse but salient. Our common empirical **experience and** experimental **psychology offer evidence that humans do not have any capacity to garner knowledge except by empirical sources.** The fact is that we believe that **there is no source of knowledge**, information, or evidence **apart from observation**, empirical scientific investigations, and our sensory experience of the world, and we believe this on the basis of our empirical a posteriori experiences and our general empirical view of how things work. For example, we believe on empirical evidence that **humans are continuous with the rest of nature and** that **we rely** like other animals **on our senses to tell us how things are.** If humans are more successful than other animals, it is not because we possess special non-experiential ways of knowing, but because we are better at cooperating, collating, and inferring. In particular **we do not have any capacity for substantive a priori knowledge. There is no known mechanism by which such knowledge would be made possible.** This is an empirical claim.

**And,** all experiences are based on the badness of pain and the goodness of pleasure. **Nagel**[[2]](#footnote-2)

I shall defend the unsurprising claim that **sensory pleasure is good and pain bad, no matter whose they are.** The point of the exercise is to see how the pressures of objectification operate in a simple case. Physical pleasure and pain do not usually depend on activities or desires which themselves raise questions of justification and value. They are just [is a] sensory experiences in relation to which we are fairly passive, but toward which we feel involuntary desire or aversion. Almost **everyone takes the avoidance of** his own **pain and** the **promotion** of his own **pleasure as subjective reason**s **for action** in a fairly simple way; they are not back up by any further reasons. On the other hand if someone pursues pain or avoids pleasure, either it as a means to some end or it is backed up by dark reasons like guilt or sexual masochism. What sort of general value, if any, ought to be assigned to pleasure and pain when we consider these facts from an objective standpoint? What kind of judgment can we reasonably make about these things when we view them in abstraction from who we are? We can begin by asking why **there is no plausibility in the zero position, that pleasure and pain have no value of any kind that can be objectively recognized.** That would mean that I have no reason to take aspirin for a severe headache, however I may in fact be motivated; and that looking at it from outside, you couldn't even say that someone had a reason not to put his hand on a hot stove, just because of the pain. Try looking at it from the outside and see whether you can manage to withhold that judgment. If the idea of objective practical reason makes any sense at all, so that there is some judgment to withhold, it does not seem possible. If the general arguments against the reality of objective reasons are no good, then **it is at least possible that I have a reason**, and not just an inclination, **to refrain from putting my hand on a hot stove.** But given the possibility, it seems meaningless to deny that this is so. Oddly enough, however, we can think of a story that would go with such a denial. It might be suggested that the aversion to pain is a useful phobia—having nothing to do with the intrinsic undesirability of pain itself—which helps us avoid or escape the injuries that are signaled by pain. (The same type of purely instrumental value might be ascribed to sensory pleasure: the pleasures of food, drink, and sex might be regarded as having no value in themselves, though our natural attraction to them assists survival and reproduction.) There would then be nothing wrong with pain in itself, and someone who was never motivated deliberately to do anything just because he knew it would reduce or avoid pain would have nothing the matter with him. He would still have involuntary avoidance reactions, otherwise it would be hard to say that he felt pain at all. And he would be motivated to reduce pain for other reasons—because it was an effective way to avoid the danger being signaled, or because interfered with some physical or mental activity that was important to him. He just wouldn't regard the pain as itself something he had any reason to avoid, even though he hated the feeling just as much as the rest of us. (And of course he wouldn't be able to justify the avoidance of pain in the way that we customarily justify avoiding what we hate without reason—that is, on the ground that even an irrational hatred makes its object very unpleasant!) There is nothing self-contradictory in this proposal, but it seems nevertheless insane. **Without some positive reason to think there is nothing in itself good or bad about having an experience you intensely like or dislike, we can't seriously regard the common impression to the contrary as a collective illusion.** Such things are at least good or bad for us, if anything is. What seems to be going on here is that we cannot from an objective standpoint withhold a certain kind of endorsement of the most direct and immediate subjective value judgments we make concerning the contents of our own consciousness. We regard ourselves as too close to those things to be mistaken in our immediate, nonideological evaluative impressions. No objective view we can attain could possibly overrule our subjective authority in such cases. There can be no reason to reject the appearances here.

Since people see their own happiness as good, they must see it as good for all people **Sayre-McCord**[[3]](#footnote-3)

**In valuing** something (**my happiness** or my rational nature, say), **there must be something I see as good about it.** Whatever **that feature** is, it **cannot be** simply **it being mine** or my getting it, **since** obviously **plenty of things that are mine**, or that I do get, **are not valuable** at all.However,whatever other feature it might be will be a property potentially possessed by things that are not mine. For instance, **if what is good about my happiness** (according to me) **is how it feels, then I am committed to thinking that this same feeling, if enjoyed by someone else, is good as well**

Thus, the standard is utilitarianism.

Prefer the standard.

**First,** equality among individuals proves util. **Cummiskey[[4]](#footnote-4)**

If one truly believes that all rational beings have an equal value, then the rational solution to such a dilemma involves maximally promoting the lives and liberties of as many rational beings as possible (chapter 5). In order to avoid this conclusion, the non-consequentialist Kantian needs to justify agent-centered constraints. As we saw in chapter 1, however, even most Kantian deontologists recognize that agent-centered constraints require a non- value-based rationale. But we have seen that Kant’s normative theory is based on an unconditionally valuable end. How can a concern for the value of rational beings lead to a refusal to sacrifice rational beings even when this would prevent other more extensive losses of rational beings? If the moral law is based on the value of rational beings and their ends, then what is the rationale for prohibiting a moral agent from maximally promoting these two tiers of value? **If I sacrifice some for the sake of others,** I do not use them arbitrarily, and **I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings.** Persons may have “dignity, that is, an unconditional and incomparable worth” that transcends any market value (GMM 436), but **persons** also **have a fundamental equality that dictates that some must sometimes give way for the sake of others** (chapters 5 and 7). The concept of the end-in-itself does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others. **If one focuses on the equal value of all rational beings**, then equal consideration suggests that one may have to sacrifice some to save many.

**And,** Threats to bodily security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize and act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibit the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose – so, my util offense outweighs theirs under their own framework

**Second,** Governments must use util. **Goodin**[[5]](#footnote-5)

Consider, first, the argument from necessity. **Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty**, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. **Public officials**, in contrast, **are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates**. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all.**That is enough to allow public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus** – assuming they want to use it at all – **to choose general rules of conduct**. Knowing aggregates and averages, **they can** proceed to **calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule**. But they cannot be sure that the payoff will do to any given individual or on any particular occasion. Their knowledge of generalities, aggregates and averages is just not sufficiently fine-grained for that.

**And,** ought” is not just a moral obligation. People recognize valid political and rule based obligations. No dictionary defines it as just a moral obligation; rather, they define it as a general duty or rightness, so proving one type of obligation to affirm, such as a utilitarian obligation, is sufficient since ought has multiple meanings.

**Third,** the fission thought experiment proves that personal identity isn’t absolute. **Shoemaker 1**[[6]](#footnote-6)

By way of explanation, consider the case Parfit uses in support of his claim that identity is not what matters: fission (Ibid., 254–255). **Suppose both of my brain hemispheres are** functional **duplicates** of the other, **and** that each of my other two triplet brothers has suffered irreversible brain damage. **A** brilliant neuro**surgeon can transplant one of my brain hemispheres into [my triplet brothers]** each brother, and **so each** survivor (we will stipulate) **will be** fully **psychologically continuous with me** upon waking up. What has happened to me? If we lack the “no branching” clause, **we are forced to say that, because both** brothers **are psychologically continuous with me, they are both me. But then** (given the transitivity of identity) **both** survivors **would** also have to **be** identical to **each other, which seems obviously false** (although see Belzer 2005 for doubts about this assertion). So to avoid violating this transitivity requirement, we simply have to stipulate in our criterion of personal identity that, if the relations in which identity consists may hold one-many, they must obtain uniquely for identity itself to obtain. But then what has happened to me in fission? It seems I cannot survive as both, so the identity relation does not obtain between me and the survivors. In addition, there simply is no non-arbitrary reason why it should obtain between me and just one of the survivors, so the only remaining option is that I do not survive fission (see Parfit 2001, 42; see also Brink 1997b, 140–141). But is this like an ordinary case in which I don't survive, i.e., like death? Clearly not: both survivors will seem to remember my thoughts and experiences, they will fulfill intentions I had in action, they will have the same beliefs/desires/goals as me, and their characters will be exactly like mine. Indeed, it will be just as if I had survived. **Everything that matters** in ordinary survival (or nearly everything), therefore, **is preserved** in fission, **despite the fact that the identity relation is not.** What **[T]his** must **mean[s]**, then, is **that the identity relation just is not what matters** (or is not what matters very much) in survival; **instead, what matters [is]** has to consist in **psychological continuity** and/or connectedness (what Parfit calls “Relation R”). As long as that relation holds between me-now and some other person-stage — regardless of whether or not it holds one-one — what happens to me is just as good as ordinary survival. Call this the Identity Doesn't Matter (IDM) view.

This means the concept of “self ownership” and “independence” are both vacuous, because there is no such thing as an individual persons moral identity. Therefore this refutes all NCs premised in autonomy and individual choice.

This means util. **Shoemaker 2**

Extreme reductionism might lend support to utilitarianism in the following way. **Many** people **claim that we are justified in maximizing the good in our own lives, but not** justified in maximizing the good **across sets of lives, simply because each of us is a single,** deeply **unified person**, unified by the further fact of identity, whereas there is no such corresponding unity across sets of lives. But if **the only justification for the different treatment** of individual lives and sets of lives **is the** further **fact [of unity], and this fact is undermined by** the truth of **reductionism, then nothing justifies this different treatment.** There are no deeply unified subjects of experience. What remains are merely the experiences themselves, and so any ethical theory distinguishing between individual lives and sets of lives is mistaken. If the deep, further fact is missing, then there are no unities. **The morally significant units should then be the states people are in at particular times, and an ethical theory that focused on them** and attempted to improve their quality, whatever their location, **would be the most plausible. Utilitarianism is just such a theory.**

## Framework Short

The standard is utilitarianism.

**First,** the fission thought experiment proves that personal identity isn’t absolute. **Shoemaker 1**[[7]](#footnote-7)

By way of explanation, consider the case Parfit uses in support of his claim that identity is not what matters: fission (Ibid., 254–255). **Suppose both of my brain hemispheres are** functional **duplicates** of the other, **and** that each of my other two triplet brothers has suffered irreversible brain damage. **A** brilliant neuro**surgeon can transplant one of my brain hemispheres into [my triplet brothers]** each brother, and **so each** survivor (we will stipulate) **will be** fully **psychologically continuous with me** upon waking up. What has happened to me? If we lack the “no branching” clause, **we are forced to say that, because both** brothers **are psychologically continuous with me, they are both me. But then** (given the transitivity of identity) **both** survivors **would** also have to **be** identical to **each other, which seems obviously false** (although see Belzer 2005 for doubts about this assertion). So to avoid violating this transitivity requirement, we simply have to stipulate in our criterion of personal identity that, if the relations in which identity consists may hold one-many, they must obtain uniquely for identity itself to obtain. But then what has happened to me in fission? It seems I cannot survive as both, so the identity relation does not obtain between me and the survivors. In addition, there simply is no non-arbitrary reason why it should obtain between me and just one of the survivors, so the only remaining option is that I do not survive fission (see Parfit 2001, 42; see also Brink 1997b, 140–141). But is this like an ordinary case in which I don't survive, i.e., like death? Clearly not: both survivors will seem to remember my thoughts and experiences, they will fulfill intentions I had in action, they will have the same beliefs/desires/goals as me, and their characters will be exactly like mine. Indeed, it will be just as if I had survived. **Everything that matters** in ordinary survival (or nearly everything), therefore, **is preserved** in fission, **despite the fact that the identity relation is not.** What **[T]his** must **mean[s]**, then, is **that the identity relation just is not what matters** (or is not what matters very much) in survival; **instead, what matters [is]** has to consist in **psychological continuity** and/or connectedness (what Parfit calls “Relation R”). As long as that relation holds between me-now and some other person-stage — regardless of whether or not it holds one-one — what happens to me is just as good as ordinary survival. Call this the Identity Doesn't Matter (IDM) view.

This means util. **Shoemaker 2**

Extreme reductionism might lend support to utilitarianism in the following way. **Many** people **claim that we are justified in maximizing the good in our own lives, but not** justified in maximizing the good **across sets of lives, simply because each of us is a single,** deeply **unified person**, unified by the further fact of identity, whereas there is no such corresponding unity across sets of lives. But if **the only justification for the different treatment** of individual lives and sets of lives **is the** further **fact [of unity], and this fact is undermined by** the truth of **reductionism, then nothing justifies this different treatment.** There are no deeply unified subjects of experience. What remains are merely the experiences themselves, and so any ethical theory distinguishing between individual lives and sets of lives is mistaken. If the deep, further fact is missing, then there are no unities. **The morally significant units should then be the states people are in at particular times, and an ethical theory that focused on them** and attempted to improve their quality, whatever their location, **would be the most plausible. Utilitarianism is just such a theory.**

**Second,** equality among individuals proves util. **Cummiskey[[8]](#footnote-8)**

If one truly believes that all rational beings have an equal value, then the rational solution to such a dilemma involves maximally promoting the lives and liberties of as many rational beings as possible (chapter 5). In order to avoid this conclusion, the non-consequentialist Kantian needs to justify agent-centered constraints. As we saw in chapter 1, however, even most Kantian deontologists recognize that agent-centered constraints require a non- value-based rationale. But we have seen that Kant’s normative theory is based on an unconditionally valuable end. How can a concern for the value of rational beings lead to a refusal to sacrifice rational beings even when this would prevent other more extensive losses of rational beings? If the moral law is based on the value of rational beings and their ends, then what is the rationale for prohibiting a moral agent from maximally promoting these two tiers of value? **If I sacrifice some for the sake of others,** I do not use them arbitrarily, and **I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings.** Persons may have “dignity, that is, an unconditional and incomparable worth” that transcends any market value (GMM 436), but **persons** also **have a fundamental equality that dictates that some must sometimes give way for the sake of others** (chapters 5 and 7). The concept of the end-in-itself does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others. **If one focuses on the equal value of all rational beings**, then equal consideration suggests that one may have to sacrifice some to save many.

**And,** Threats to bodily security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize and act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibit the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose – so, my util offense outweighs theirs under their own framework

**Third,** Governments must use util. **Goodin**[[9]](#footnote-9)

Consider, first, the argument from necessity. **Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty**, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. **Public officials**, in contrast, **are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates**. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all.**That is enough to allow public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus** – assuming they want to use it at all – **to choose general rules of conduct**. Knowing aggregates and averages, **they can** proceed to **calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule**. But they cannot be sure that the payoff will do to any given individual or on any particular occasion. Their knowledge of generalities, aggregates and averages is just not sufficiently fine-grained for that.

## Contention Long

Plan Text: Municipal, local, and state governments[[10]](#footnote-10) will implement a living wage for airport workers across the country in line with the living wage as part of San Francisco International Airport’s Quality Standards Program. **Reich[[11]](#footnote-11) et al 03:**

The living wage experience at SFO is also pertinent to nationally prominent questions of airport security. The Quality Standards Program was explicitly designed to improve safety and security at SFO. After September 11, the low pay and high turnover among screeners nationally was recognized as a major weakness of airport security systems and became the focus of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, signed into law in November of 2001. The changes in pay, training and supervision now being instituted at airports across the country were already in place at SFO on September 11. The SFO experience prior to September 11 therefore provides lessons for all major airports. Moreover, SFO remains innovative: as part of a national experiment it will continue contract status for its screeners while all other very large airports federalize their screeners in 2002.

**Advantage 1 Security**

TSA workers are failing to catch security threats - employee turnover is the root cause **Edwards[[12]](#footnote-12) 13:**

TSA’s performance at security screening has been mediocre at best. In the years fol­lowing the federal takeover, auditors typi­cally found that the government’s screen­ing was no better than the previous private screening.22 There have been numerous dis­turbing incidents of screening failures. In 2006, screeners in Los Angeles and Chicago failed to catch 75 percent and 60 percent, respectively, of fake explosives in tests.23 There were 25,000 security breaches at U.S. airports during TSA’s first [the] decade, despite the agency’s huge spending and all the in­conveniences imposed on passengers.24 The safety of travelers in recent years may have more to do with the dearth of terrorists in the United States and other security layers around aviation, than with the performance of TSA airport screeners. TSA workforces at numerous airports have been subject to “meltdowns,” as Representa­tive Mica calls them. In 2011, the TSA sought to fire 12 baggage screeners for botching se­curity procedures at the Charlotte airport.25 The same year at the Honolulu airport, 28 employees were fired and 15 were suspended for violating screening rules.26 In 2012, TSA proposed firing 25 workers because of screen­ing failures at the Newark airport, although only 4 were eventually removed.27 And at the Fort Myers airport, 38 screeners were sus­pended and 5 were fired.28 In 2012, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that TSA ranked 232 out of 240 federal agencies on employee satisfaction.29 In 2013, the GAO reported that there has been a large increase in TSA employee misconduct in recent years.30 One problem is substantial employee theft at the agency. ABC News found out that nearly 400 TSA workers have been fired for stealing items from passenger bags.31 Yet another problem is high employee turnover. Be­tween 2002 and 2011, TSA spent $2.4 billion just on the hiring and training of new staff members.32 Management problems stemming from TSA’s large screening workforce distract the agency from its core responsibilities in avia­tion security.

SFO living wage solves turnover – empirics prove. **Bernstein 05**

A final important impact study is Reich, Hall and Jacobs's (2003) analysis of a particularly broad ordinance (in terms of coverage, wages, and other mandates, such as training standards) implemented at the San Francisco International Airport in 2000. While the authors find the expected increase in wages (they not that the wage of affected entry-level workers rose by an average of 33 percent), what's most notable about their findings are the efficiency wage effects. They report that turnover fell by an average of 34 percent among firms covered by the ordinance and that the decline in turnover rates increase with wages. To cite a particularly relevant occupation in our post-9/11 world, they report that turnover among airport security screeners, whose average wage rose by 55 percent after the living wage went into effect, fell from 94.7 percent per year to 18.7 percent fifteen months later. While Fairris (2003) finds a negative relation between living wages and training, Reich, Hall, and Jacobs report increased trainings as mandated by the ordinance itself. Finally, while they argue that employed levels were not affected by the ordinance, they do not offer the controls that would enable them to test this assertion relative to unaffected firms.

It’s causation not just correlation. **WPU[[13]](#footnote-13) 13:**

Results from the employee survey at SJC found that, despite the vital role they play in successful airport operations, many workers earn no more than the state’s minimum wage ($8/hr**)**, do not have access to **employer sponsored** health insurance, and [thus] have few incentives to stay in their jobs long term. Consequently, one of the chief economic engines of Silicon Valley relies on a workforce that can’t afford local rents and is denied basic benefits such as healthcare and time off.

Empirics confirm, the plan solves turnover and decreases security **Reich et al ‘03**

Service levels improved, as did indicators of security. **The benefits of the QSP for** airport customers **include** higher security and improved quality of service. Almost half (45 percent) of all employers reported that customer service improved; only 3 percent thought it had worsened. Our analysis of FAA data for 19 large airports found that lower turnover is associated with higher rates of detection of security breaches.

Even absent the turnover link, living wage directly incentivizes workers to work harder and pay attention to training protocol – empirics confirm. **Reich et al 3:**

Significant percentages of employees covered by the QSP reported that they are working harder at their jobs (44 percent), that more skills are required of them (50 percent**),** and that the pace of work increased after the implementation of the **new** rules (37 percent). Average job performance by QSP-covered workers improved substantially. One-third of all SFO employers, accounting for over half of all employees, reported improved overall job performance among workers covered by the QSP. The proportion of employers who reported improvements in employee morale was 47 percent, decreases in employee grievances (45 percent)**,** decreases in employee disciplinary issues (44 percent), and decreases in absenteeism (29 percent). In each category most of the remaining employers reported no change; few employers reported any deterioration in performance. The QSP mandates increased worker training, which helped improve worker performance. By increasing pay, the QSP also made training more desirable to employers. Twenty-five percent of QSP-covered employers increased the training programs they were providing their workforce. Among non-QSP firms, the comparable figure was eleven percent. None of the firms reported a decrease in training.

Terrorists are planning airport-based attacks now and almost succeeding. **Harshbarger 14[[14]](#footnote-14)**

**Terrorists are plotting to blow up five passenger planes** flying between European cities **as part of a Christmas “spectacular**,” according to a British newspaper report. “**Everyone is expecting something catastrophic very soon**,” a source [told the Sunday Express](http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/541725/REVEALED-Al-Qaeda-plot-to-blow-up-5-European-passenger-jets-in-Christmas-spectacular" \t "_blank). “We’ve been told that **five planes are being targeted in a high-profile hit before Christmas. They’ve been waiting for the big one.”** London authorities were the first to uncover the threat, which would involve midair bombings, a source told The Post. “**There is a credible threat that they’re concerned about**,’’ another source said. “They’ve known about it for a while.” Airport security sources told the Sunday Express that **Islamic radicals plan to smuggle bombs onto the planes in carry-on luggage.**

Solvency is key to preventing terrorism – threats are increasing in the squo so the brink is now. Goudie[[15]](#footnote-15) 9/14

Team reports that congressional investigators have found widespread problems in the way the Transportation Security Administration keeps us safe from terrorists. This chilling report couldn't come at a worse time for the airlines and aviation security. Even as federal law enforcement warns of ISIS terrorists with American passports, a new report suggests western jihadists could slip onto airplanes because of holes in TSA security. The Government Accounting Office hits two basic TSA functions: passenger screening and the terrorist watch list.  Since 9/11 at O'Hare, Midway and other U.S. airports, there has been a labyrinth of security that passengers must walk through to prevent bombs, guns and other weapons from getting on board commercial aircraft. Behind the scenes, the TSA operates a program called "Secure Flight Passenger Data" aimed at matching passenger names with those on the no-fly terrorist watch list. [and] There are serious glitches with both basic TSA programs, according to an investigation by the GAO. They include: TSA problems spotting fake ID's and boarding passes and other screening errors; [and] the "secure flight" program has flaws matching passenger names with known [terrorists]jihadists; the report criticizes TSA's procedures to evaluate these problems and that TSA needs advanced technology. A TSA official was on the hot seat Thursday in Washington. "How is TSA addressing this problem of fraudulent IDs and boarding passes?" said Rep. Richard Hudson, R-North Carolina.  "TSA is making better progress with boarding pass issues than issues of potential fraudulent ID's, I would say. As far as confirming that the Id that the individual is using is genuine, that is still the responsibility of the travel document checker at this point. TSA has awarded a contract for the development of credential authentication and tech but it was just awarded in April and I believe it's still in the concept stage so that tech support is still quite a ways out," said Jennifer Grover, Transportation Safety Administration.  During that hearing on Capitol Hill there was new-found urgency to these airport security issues because of what is happening overseas with ISIS terrorists. Committee members agree there is a delicate balancing act underway between airline safety and civil liberties, but say this country needs to be protected from extremists with western passports who have joined the fight in Iraq or Syria.

Terrorists’ love for destruction creates existential threats. **Lippman ’03[[16]](#footnote-16)**

The contemporary era has ushered in a "new terrorism." n44 Terrorist groups, in the past, generally possessed coherent ideological platforms and aspirations and selected targets which advanced and symbolized these goals. n45 They were sensitive to the need to maintain political legitimacy and avoided intentionally targeting innocents. n46 The "new terrorists," in **[\*303]** contrast, are driven by an apocalyptic and millenarian religiously-based worldview which posits that the world must be destroyed in order to cleanse the globe of paganism and impurity. n47 This predisposes contemporary terrorists to develop and to deploy nuclear, biological and chemical weapons (NBC) of mass destruction (WMD), n48 which are increasingly available in the global marketplace. n49 The trend is towards increasingly lethal terrorist incidents and an escalating number of fatalities. n50 This is encouraged by the enhanced technological sophistication of terrorists n51 who increasingly are drawn from the ranks of amateur attackers who lack the capacity to carefully calibrate and to control the consequences of their violent conduct. n52¶ The spectacular incident also has become the currency of the contemporary terrorists who are caught in a spiral of ever-more dramatic acts of violence to attract media and public attention and to draw the young and impressionable to their ranks. n53 The tightly organized, hierarchical terrorist organization has been replaced by fluid, decentralized and specialized cells which temporarily cooperate and coalesce around particular projects. n54 The individuals involved often lack clear organizational identities and increasingly fail to claim credit or to offer an explanation for the attack. n55 Terrorists also increasingly transcend national boundaries and rely on technology to coordinate and cooperate in their **[\*304]** operations and to carry out operations across the globe. n56 Terrorist groups also rely on a far-flung, sophisticated and difficult to penetrate international financial networks which involve cooperation with drug cartels and petty criminals and other illegitimate enterprises as well as with legitimate charitable organizations, mining interests, currency traders and businesses. n57¶ This new terrorism also is associated with the advent of the "super-terrorist," n58 individuals characterized by a megalomaniacal desire to leave a historically unprecedented mark of mass devastation and death. n59 These pernicious personalities are distinguished by a fascination with technological innovation and implementation rather than by a strong commitment to a political cause. n60 Destruction rather than doctrine is the animating aspect of their activity. n61 The sadistic "super-terrorist" thus belies the conventional conception of terrorists as reasonable and rationale individuals who have adopted violent tactics in order to achieve limited political objectives. n62

Solving now is uniquely key, terrorists will otherwise use ebola in an attack **CBS ‘14[[17]](#footnote-17)**

**WASHINGTON (WNEW) – Islamic** **S**tate of **I**raq and **S**yria **terrorists may use “carriers” to spread the Ebola virus as part of a low-tech biological terror tactic, according to national security and health experts**. Capt. Al Shimkus, a retired professor of National Security Affairs at the U.S. Naval War College, [told Forbes](http://www.forbes.com/sites/brucedorminey/2014/10/05/ebola-as-isis-bio-weapon/) that **ISIS**/ISIL **fanatics may infect themselves with** the **Ebola** virus **to use it as a suicide bio-weapon** against the West. Shimkus says that the Islamic State terrorists wouldn’t even have to “isolate” the virus, but instead could send a few operatives into an Ebola outbreak region and intentionally expose themselves to the rampant virus. “The individual exposed to the Ebola virus would be the carrier,” Shimkus told Forbes. “In the context of terrorist activity, **it doesn’t take much sophistication to go to that next step** to use a human being as a carrier.” Several **experts say this is** a “**plausible** theory,” because **ISIS** fighters **could contract the virus and then openly travel to** Western countries **to spread Ebola** as part of a suicide mission. The virus spreads through direct contact with infected bodily fluids, or even bedding and clothing that has been “contaminated” with these fluids. According to the U.N. World Health Organization (WHO), the average fatality rate from Ebola, hemorrhagic fever, is 50 percent. Without treatment, that statistic is elevated to as high as 90 percent. The virus has claimed more than 3,800 lives in West Africa as cases have begun emerging in Europe and the United States. “In some ways it’s a plausible theory – IS fighters believe in suicide and this is a potential job for a suicide mission,” Professor Anthony Glees, the Director at Buckingham University’s Center for Security and Intelligence Studies, told Forbes. “**They are sufficiently murderous and well-informed to consider it**, and they know that we’ve been remiss in the UK.” In May 2013, Amanda Teckman, author of the paper “The Bioterrorist Threat of Ebola in East Africa and Implications For Global Health and Security,” wrote that “The threat of **an Ebola bioterrorist attack** in East Africa **is a global health and security concern, and should not be ignored**.” On Tuesday, Rep. Duncan Hunter, R-Calif., [told Fox News](http://washington.cbslocal.com/2014/10/08/gop-rep-at-least-ten-isis-fighters-have-been-caught-coming-across-the-mexican-border/" \t "_blank) that “at least ten ISIS fighters have been caught coming across the Mexican border in Texas.” He echoed August comments by Gen. Martin Dempsey that the U.S.’s open southern border posed an “immediate threat” to national security. On Thursday, the director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention said that the Ebola outbreak is unlike anything he’s since the AIDS epidemic. “I would say that in the 30 years I’ve been working in public health, the only thing like this has been AIDS,” Frieden said before the heads of the United Nations, World Bank and International Monetary Fund, according to AFP. “We have to work now so that it is not the world’s next AIDS.”

Spread of Ebola causes extinction **Turchin ‘14[[18]](#footnote-18)**

These **preliminary calculations show that risks of global catastrophe from Ebola should be under assessment.** Such catastrophes may not mean total human extinction, as only around 70% of people infected currently die from Ebola (and even less because we don’t know, or share, asymptomatic cases), but still, this means the end of the world as we know it. **This virus is the first step towards** the road of **full extinction** – see more below. Some have said that Western countries are not under any risk because of their high quality medicine and sanitation, but success mostly depends on the way in which the virus mutates: this is a big unknown…Mutations of virus could lead to two bad things and one good. RNA viruses are known to mutate especially quick. Bad viruses are airborne while the second one may take on many different forms of the virus. Good forms of the virus provide a milder form, which will dominate and provide immunity. Risks of an evolving multi-pandemic Let’s look first on the risk from many forms of the viruses. If the virus will mutate quickly, **there will be many different strains of it, so it will ultimately create a multi-pandemic.** (There are also many different strains of AIDS and TB, but they are rarely overlapping which may happen only when an entire population is exposed). **Some of the strains may became airborne**, or have higher transmission rates, but the main risk from multi-pandemic is that **it overcomes defenses provided by the natural variability of the human genome and immunity**. (By the way, the human genome variability is very low because of the recent bottle neck in the history of our population. Any chimpanzee has more differentiation from another chimpanzee than human beings have between other human beings: Pygmies have more in common with Nordic blondes than chimps have with each other. <http://theadvancedapes.com/201328great-ape-and-human-genetic-diversity/>) We are almost clones from the view point of genetic variability typical for natural populations. **The Human race is** very unique – it has very large population but **very small genetic diversity**. It means that it is **more susceptible to pandemics**. Also, a large homogenous population is ideal for breeding different strains of infection. There are no many natural examples of such large and homogeneous populations, in which exist high level of communication between all its parts (I mean global air travel). Such populations of clones exist in the world of plants. Most of them are fine, but the population of one particular banana was completely wiped out by a specific rust (see more http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Panama\_disease). All bananas of this specie were clones: Now we eat different bananas. My point is that a large homogenous population is an ideal breeding ground for a multi-pandemic. If **the genetic diversity of a pathogen is bigger than human diversity**, than **it could cause a near total extinction**, and also, large and homogenous populations help breed such a diversity of pathogens feeding on the population.

And, Extinction comes first under any ethical theory **Bostrom**[[19]](#footnote-19)

These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest[s]** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk. Let me elaborate. Our [**that** our] present understanding of axiology might well be confused. **We may not** now **know**—at least not in concrete detail—**what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity;** we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. **If we are** indeed profoundly **uncertain about our** ultimate **aims,** then we should recognize that **there is** a **great** option **value in preserving**—and ideally improving—**our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely **is** plausibly **the best way** available to us **to increase the probability that the future will contain** a lot of **value.**

Additionally, all moral theories value their own implementation. The only reason deontology is valuable, for example, is because it causes people to actually treat other people as ends. This is not the fallacy of origin: if morality didn’t value its own application it would cease to guide action and lose normativity. Extinction comes first then because people being a live is a pre-requisite to morality making demands.

Advantage 2 Economy

The U.S. aviation sector is rapidly declining in the status quo – terrible service at airports is the root cause. Smith**[[20]](#footnote-20)** 13:

Our airports are terrible, and our airlines find it harder and harder to compete. We've done it to ourselves through shortsightedness, underfunding, and flyer-unfriendly policies. In a CNN poll of 1,200 overseas business travelers who have visited the United States, a full 20 percent of them said they would not visit the US again due to onerous entry procedures at airports, including long processing lines. Forty-three percent said they would discourage others from visiting the US. "The United States risks falling behind Asia, the Middle East, and Europe as the global aviation leader." - Carol Hallett, US Chamber of Commerce counsel n Air Line Pilot magazine I'd say that battle was lost a long time ago. The United States of America may have pioneered commercial aviation, but today the crossroads of global air commerce are places like Dubai, Frankfurt, Istanbul, Seoul, and Bangkok. These are the places - not New York or Chicago or Los Angeles - that are setting the standards. They have the best airports and the fastest-growing airlines, and they offer the most convenience for travelers. Some of their success is owed to simple geography. Dubai, for instance, is perfectly placed between the planet's biggest population centers. It's the ideal transfer hub for the millions of people moving between Asia and Europe, Asia and Africa, North America and the Near East, and so forth. The government of the UAE saw this opportunity years ago, and began to invest accordingly. Today, Dubai airport is **one of the world's busiest, and its airline, Emirates, is now** the world's third-largest in terms of capacity**. The book value of the planes** Emirates **has on order - to say nothing of the 200 widebody jets it already operates -** exceeds the value of the entire US airline industry! Not far from Dubai, Istanbul's Ataturk Airport is poised to become a similar mega-hub. Its hometown carrier, Turkish Airline, in addition to winning numerous service awards, now flies to more countries (94) than any other airline in the world. There's not much we can do about geography. At the same time, there's no excuse for the US aviation sector to have fallen so far. We've done it to ourselves through shortsightedness, underfunding, and flyer-unfriendly policies. Compare for a minute our air travel infrastructure to that of, say, the United Arab Emirates, South Korea, or Germany. It's not even close. Our airports are substandard across a number of fronts; our air traffic control system is underfunded; Customs and Border Protection facilities are understaffed; airline passengers are groped, taxed, and hassled, to the point where, if that CNN poll is to be believed, millions of them will refuse to visit the country. The government seems to treat air travel as a nuisance, something to be dissuaded, rather than a vital contributor of tens of billions of dollars to the annual economy. And although our physical location may not be ideal as a transfer point, there are still plenty of travelers moving between continents who can and should be patronizing US airports and US carriers - if only we weren't driving them away. For those traveling between Australia and Europe, for example, or between Asia and South America, the US makes - or should make - a logical transfer point. Why can't LAX, JFK, and MIA work the way Dubai, Hong Kong, and Amsterdam do? Hell, we don't even try. American airports simply do not recognize the "in transit" concept. All passengers arriving from overseas, even if they're merely transiting to a third country, are forced to clear customs and immigration, re-check their luggage, pass through TSA screening, etc. It's an enormous hassle that you don't find in most places overseas, where transit passengers walk from one gate to the next with a minimum of fuss. Flying from Australia to Europe, for example, a traveler has two options: He or she can fly: Westbound, via Asia (through Singapore, Bangkok, Kuala Lumpur or Hong Kong) or the Middle East (Dubai, Qatar, Abu Dhabi, etc.), or Eastbound via the US West Coast (via Los Angeles or San Francisco) Even though the distance and flying times are about the same, almost everybody will opt for the westbound option. The airports are spotless and packed with amenities; the connections painless and efficient. To change planes at LAX or SFO, on the other hand, a passenger must stand in at least three different lines, be photographed and fingerprinted, collect and re-check his bags, and endure the full TSA rigmarole before slogging through a noisy, dirty, claustrophobic terminal to the correct departure gate. Traveling between Asia and South America, it's a similar story. Europe to Latin America, same thing. Few passengers on these routes will choose to connect in the United States because we've made it so damn inconvenient. Heaven help the poor slob who tries connecting at JFK, which is broken up into eight completely separate terminals. In addition to each of the hassles just mentioned, switching between airlines requires that you leave the building completely and catch a train. We can only guess at how many millions of passengers our carriers lose out on each year because of all this. To add insult to injury, airline tickets in America are taxed to the hilt. Overall flying is a lot more affordable than it has been in decades past, but if it feels expensive, one of the reasons is the multitude of government-imposed taxes and fees. There's an excise tax, the 9/11 Security Fee, the Federal Segment Fee, the Passenger Facility Charges, International Arrival and Departure Taxes, Immigration and Customs user fees, an Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service charge, and so on -- a whopping 17 total fees! Airline tickets are taxed at a higher federal rate than alcohol and tobacco. And now there's a proposal to double the security taxes.

SFO living wage solves – empirics confirm. **WPU 2:**

But despite these natural and geographic advantages, of the region’s three major airports, San Jose has the smallest market share. **In the past twelve months,** SJC served 10.3 million scheduled passengers, compared to **14.0 million served by Oakland International and** 26.1 million at SFO. While th**ese two competing** airport**s** **have both** increased **their** passengers served by more than 19% **since 2002,** SJC **has** lagged behind with **growth of** just 2.8%. **San Jose International Airport** is losing market share (see Figure 1). In a before-and-after study evaluating the effects of the living wage policies and associated training standards enacted at [SFO]San Francisco Airport, UC Berkeley researchers found that employers reported an increase in customer service, as well as improvements in overall work performance and employee morale, The researches concluded that these findings “suggest[ed] that improvements in worker performance were widespread across the airport.”18 San Francisc**o** **and Oakland** Airports **both enjoy** comprehensive **Living Wage policies** that apply to virtually all workers, including contractors. San Jose does not.

Growth in the airport sector is key to the nationwide economy. **Smith[[21]](#footnote-21) 12:**

This study examined more than 75 state and individual airport economic impact studies to obtain direct economic impact data for 272 out of the 490 commercial airports analyzed. A detailed, highly correlated regression analysis was developed that estimated direct impact data for the other airports as needed. These direct impact results were used as input for an IMPLAN economic impact model that produced the multiplier impacts found within the U.S. This analysis found that the 490 commercial airports in the U.S.: Support 10.5 million jobs Create an annual payroll of $365 billion Produce an annual output of $1.2 trillion. These economic impacts are a significant contributor to the national economy. Not only do these airports provide vital transportation links that permit the rapid, efficient, and cost‐effective movement of people, goods and services, they account for more than 8 percent of the national GDP and support more than 7 percent of the country’s work force.

U.S. economy is key to global economy. **Forbes[[22]](#footnote-22) 06**

The unfolding U.S. banking crisis is spreading to the entire global financial system, potentially exerting a systemic impact. Thus, the first truly global crisis could emerge, challenging policymakers’ pre-globalization economic toolbox.There is much that remains unknown about the nature of the global economy in the absence of sufficient data and adequate theoretical frameworks. As a consequence, the impact the current crisis may have on the global economy is uncertain. However, past crises have much to say about the likely contagion mechanisms and suggest questions that should be asked during this one. financial contagion. Financial sector contagion takes three forms: –Counterparties. [1] There is a direct impact through counterparty channels. The list of financial institutions liable to be affected includes all but the most isolated and remote financial-service institutions of the world. –Risk perception. The second channel is indirect, via [2] risk perception. The problem is many global relationships evolve[s] day-by-day, resulting in significant uncertainty about the way risk spreads in the global economy. –[3] Cost of capital. The price of risk rises substantially. This affects all asset classes that are categorized as high risk and can easily have an impact on low-risk asset classes as well. **Sectoral contagion.** If liquidity shortages last, a systemic impact is likely in nonfinancial sectors. As has happened over the past few days, this can lead to a substantially increased number of liquidity interventions by central banks and even some treasuries. Arguments then emerge over whether there is a meaningful distinction between “illiquidity” and “insolvency,” signaling policymakers’ anxiety levels. Although the liquidity crunch tends to be local–albeit with important global inter-linkages–the demand effect of the crisis is truly global and will affect all open economies. The problem is that the well-tested textbook answer–namely tight fiscal policy coupled with somewhat loose monetary policy–is implausible on the global level. This is due to the lack of an institution that could coordinate such a global-level policy response.In short, the financial crisis could lead to an overall systemic crisis through worsening local credit conditions, as well as through shrinking global real economy demand.

Econ collapse leads to extinction. **Bearden 2k[[23]](#footnote-23)**

History bears out that **desperate nations take desperate actions. Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress** on nations **will have increased** the intensity and number of their **conflicts,** to the point wherethearsenals of weapons of mass destruction (**WMD**) now possessed by some 25 nations, **are almost certain to be released.** As an example, suppose a starving North Korea launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China-whose long-range nuclear missiles (some) can reach the United States-attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, themutual **treaties** involved in such scenarios **will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly.** Strategic nuclear **studies have shown** for decades **that, under such** extreme stress **conditions, once a few nukes are launched, adversaries** and potential adversaries **are** then **compelled to launch on perception of preparations by one's adversary.** The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs. Today, a great percent of the WMD arsenals that will be unleashed, are already on site within the United States itself. **The resulting** great **Armageddon will destroy civilization** as we know it, **and** **perhaps most of the biosphere**, at least for many decades.

And, decline is net worse for the environment Klare ‘8**[[24]](#footnote-24)**

The Downside But there is a downside to all this as well. Most serious is the risk that venture capitalists will refrain from pouring big bucks into innovative energy projects. At an energy forum organized by professional services firm Ernst & Young on October 9, experts warned of a sharp drop-off in alternative energy funding. "The concept of alternative energy has a lot of momentum," says Dan Pickering, head of research for Tudor, Pickering, Holt & Co. Securities in Houston. "But lower oil prices make it harder to justify investment. At $50 a barrel, a lot of that investment will die." [If] governments could also have a hard time coming up with the funds to finance alternative energy projects**.** Moderators at the presidential debates repeatedly asked both JohnMcCain and **Barack** Obama **what programs they would cut in order to finance the massive financial-rescue packages the Bush administration has engineered in order to avert further economic distress. Both insisted that their respective** energy initiatives **would be spared any such belt-tightening. It is highly likely, however, that costly endeavors of this sort** will be scaled backor postponed once the magnitude of the financial rescue effort becomes apparent. The same is true for Europe and Japan, who have also pledged to undertake ambitious energy initiatives in their drive to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. Indeed, leaders of **some** European **Union** countries are calling for a slowdown in efforts to curb emissions of greenhouse gases due to the burgeoning economic crisis. Under a plan adopted by the EU in 2007, member countries pledged to reduce such emissions by 20% below 1990 levels by 2020, which is far more ambitious than the Kyoto Protocol. European leaders are scheduled to implement a detailed plan to achieve this goal by December of this year. But at a rancorous summit meeting of the EU heads of state in mid-October, Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi of Italy and the leaders of some Eastern European countries indicated that due to the current crisis, they were no longer able to finance the high costs of attaining the 2020 goal and so weren't prepared to adopt a detailed plan. "We don't think this is the moment to push forward on our own like Don Quixote," Berlusconi declared at the summit. "We have time." At some point, the price of gasoline will fall so low that many drivers will once again engage in the wasteful driving habits they may have given up when the price of gas soared over $3 per gallon. This may not occur right away. But with crude oil at $70 per barrel, half of what it was in August, a corresponding drop in the price of refined products will eventually follow. And that could lead people to see cheap gasoline as the one bright spot on an otherwise dismal horizon. It's unclear at this point whether the crisis will do more good or more harm for the environment. In the short term, it will certainly slow the increase in carbon dioxide emissions. It will also cause a delay in developing environmentally hazardous projects like Canadian tar sands. But if the crisis also sets back development of energy alternatives for any significant length of time, it will cancel out any of these positive developments. Many people are waiting and watching what happens in the global financial markets**.**

## Contention Short

Plan Text: Municipal, local, and state governments[[25]](#footnote-25) will implement a living wage for airport workers across the country in line with the living wage as part of San Francisco International Airport’s Quality Standards Program.

**Advantage 1 Security**

TSA workers are failing to catch security threats - employee turnover is the root cause **Edwards[[26]](#footnote-26) 13:**

TSA’s performance at security screening has been mediocre at best. In the years fol­lowing the federal takeover, auditors typi­cally found that the government’s screen­ing was no better than the previous private screening.22 There have been numerous dis­turbing incidents of screening failures. In 2006, screeners in L**os** A**ngeles** and Chicago failed to catch 75 percent and 60 percent, respectively, of fake explosives in tests.23 There were 25,000 security breaches at U.S. airports during TSA’s first [decade, despite the agency’s huge spending and all the in­conveniences imposed on passengers.24 The safety of travelers in recent years may have more to do with the dearth of terrorists in the United States and other security layers around aviation, than with the performance of TSA airport screeners. TSA workforces at numerous airports have been subject to “meltdowns,” as Representa­tive Mica calls them. In 2011, the TSA sought to fire 12 baggage screeners for botching se­curity procedures at the Charlotte airport.25 The same year at the Honolulu airport, 28 employees were fired and 15 were suspended for violating screening rules.26 In 2012, TSA proposed firing 25 workers because of screen­ing failures at the Newark airport, although only 4 were eventually removed.27 And at the Fort Myers airport, 38 screeners were sus­pended and 5 were fired.28 In 2012, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that TSA ranked 232 out of 240 federal agencies on employee satisfaction.29 In 2013, the GAO reported that there has been a large increase in TSA employee misconduct in recent years.30 One problem is substantial employee theft at the agency. ABC News found out that nearly 400 TSA workers have been fired for stealing items from passenger bags.31 Yet another problem is high employee turnover. Be­tween 2002 and 2011, TSA spent $2.4 billion just on the hiring and training of new staff members.32 Management problems stemming from TSA’s large screening workforce distract the agency from its core responsibilities in avia­tion security.

SFO living wage solves turnover – empirics prove. **Bernstein 05**

A final important impact study is Reich, Hall and Jacobs's (2003) analysis of a particularly broad ordinance (in terms of coverage, wages, and other mandates, such as training standards) implemented at the San Francisco International Airport in 2000. While the authors find the expected increase in wages (they not that the wage of affected entry-level workers rose by an average of 33 percent), what's most notable about their findings are the efficiency wage effects. They report that turnover fell by an average of 34 percent among firms covered by the ordinance and that the decline in turnover rates increase with wages. To cite a particularly relevant occupation in our post-9/11 world, they report that turnover among airport security screeners, whose average wage rose by 55 percent after the living wage went into effect, fell from 94.7 percent per year to 18.7 percent fifteen months later. While Fairris (2003) finds a negative relation between living wages and training, Reich, Hall, and Jacobs report increased trainings as mandated by the ordinance itself. Finally, while they argue that employed levels were not affected by the ordinance, they do not offer the controls that would enable them to test this assertion relative to unaffected firms.

Empirics confirm, the plan solves turnover and decreases security **Reich et al ‘03**

Service levels improved, as did indicators of security. **The benefits of the QSP for** airport customers **include** higher security and improved quality of service. Almost half (45 percent) of all employers reported that customer service improved; only 3 percent thought it had worsened. Our analysis of FAA data for 19 large airports found that lower turnover is associated with higher rates of detection of security breaches.

Even absent the turnover link, living wage directly incentivizes workers to work harder and pay attention to training protocol – empirics confirm. **Reich et al 3:**

Significant percentages of employees covered by the QSP reported that they are working harder at their jobs (44 percent), that more skills are required of them (50 percent**),** and that the pace of work increased after the implementation of the **new** rules (37 percent). Average job performance by QSP-covered workers improved substantially. One-third of all SFO employers, accounting for over half of all employees, reported improved overall job performance among workers covered by the QSP. The proportion of employers who reported improvements in employee morale was 47 percent, decreases in employee grievances (45 percent)**,** decreases in employee disciplinary issues (44 percent), and decreases in absenteeism (29 percent). In each category most of the remaining employers reported no change; few employers reported any deterioration in performance. The QSP mandates increased worker training, which helped improve worker performance. By increasing pay, the QSP also made training more desirable to employers. Twenty-five percent of QSP-covered employers increased the training programs they were providing their workforce. Among non-QSP firms, the comparable figure was eleven percent. None of the firms reported a decrease in training.

Solvency is key to preventing terrorism – threats are increasing in the squo so the brink is now. Goudie[[27]](#footnote-27) 9/14

Team reports that congressional investigators have found widespread problems in the way the Transportation Security Administration keeps us safe from terrorists. This chilling report couldn't come at a worse time for the airlines and aviation security. Even as federal law enforcement warns of ISIS terrorists with American passports, a new report suggests western jihadists could slip onto airplanes because of holes in TSA security. The Government Accounting Office hits two basic TSA functions: passenger screening and the terrorist watch list.  Since 9/11 at O'Hare, Midway and other U.S. airports, there has been a labyrinth of security that passengers must walk through to prevent bombs, guns and other weapons from getting on board commercial aircraft. Behind the scenes, the TSA operates a program called "Secure Flight Passenger Data" aimed at matching passenger names with those on the no-fly terrorist watch list. [and] There are serious glitches with both basic TSA programs, according to an investigation by the GAO. They include: TSA problems spotting fake ID's and boarding passes and other screening errors; [and] the "secure flight" program has flaws matching passenger names with known [terrorists]jihadists; the report criticizes TSA's procedures to evaluate these problems and that TSA needs advanced technology. A TSA official was on the hot seat Thursday in Washington. "How is TSA addressing this problem of fraudulent IDs and boarding passes?" said Rep. Richard Hudson, R-North Carolina.  "TSA is making better progress with boarding pass issues than issues of potential fraudulent ID's, I would say. As far as confirming that the Id that the individual is using is genuine, that is still the responsibility of the travel document checker at this point. TSA has awarded a contract for the development of credential authentication and tech but it was just awarded in April and I believe it's still in the concept stage so that tech support is still quite a ways out," said Jennifer Grover, Transportation Safety Administration.  During that hearing on Capitol Hill there was new-found urgency to these airport security issues because of what is happening overseas with ISIS terrorists. Committee members agree there is a delicate balancing act underway between airline safety and civil liberties, but say this country needs to be protected from extremists with western passports who have joined the fight in Iraq or Syria.

Terrorists’ love for destruction creates existential threats. **Lippman ’03[[28]](#footnote-28)**

The contemporary era has ushered in a "new terrorism." n44 Terrorist groups, in the past, generally possessed coherent ideological platforms and aspirations and selected targets which advanced and symbolized these goals. n45 They were sensitive to the need to maintain political legitimacy and avoided intentionally targeting innocents. n46 The "new terrorists," in **[\*303]** contrast, are driven by an apocalyptic and millenarian religiously-based worldview which posits that the world must be destroyed in order to cleanse the globe of paganism and impurity. n47 This predisposes contemporary terrorists to develop and to deploy nuclear, biological and chemical weapons (NBC) of mass destruction (WMD), n48 which are increasingly available in the global marketplace. n49 The trend is towards increasingly lethal terrorist incidents and an escalating number of fatalities. n50 This is encouraged by the enhanced technological sophistication of terrorists n51 who increasingly are drawn from the ranks of amateur attackers who lack the capacity to carefully calibrate and to control the consequences of their violent conduct. n52¶ The spectacular incident also has become the currency of the contemporary terrorists who are caught in a spiral of ever-more dramatic acts of violence to attract media and public attention and to draw the young and impressionable to their ranks. n53 The tightly organized, hierarchical terrorist organization has been replaced by fluid, decentralized and specialized cells which temporarily cooperate and coalesce around particular projects. n54 The individuals involved often lack clear organizational identities and increasingly fail to claim credit or to offer an explanation for the attack. n55 Terrorists also increasingly transcend national boundaries and rely on technology to coordinate and cooperate in their **[\*304]** operations and to carry out operations across the globe. n56 Terrorist groups also rely on a far-flung, sophisticated and difficult to penetrate international financial networks which involve cooperation with drug cartels and petty criminals and other illegitimate enterprises as well as with legitimate charitable organizations, mining interests, currency traders and businesses. n57¶ This new terrorism also is associated with the advent of the "super-terrorist," n58 individuals characterized by a megalomaniacal desire to leave a historically unprecedented mark of mass devastation and death. n59 These pernicious personalities are distinguished by a fascination with technological innovation and implementation rather than by a strong commitment to a political cause. n60 Destruction rather than doctrine is the animating aspect of their activity. n61 The sadistic "super-terrorist" thus belies the conventional conception of terrorists as reasonable and rationale individuals who have adopted violent tactics in order to achieve limited political objectives. n62

And, Extinction comes first under any ethical theory **Bostrom**[[29]](#footnote-29)

These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest[s]** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk. Let me elaborate. Our [**that** our] present understanding of axiology might well be confused. **We may not** now **know**—at least not in concrete detail—**what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity;** we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. **If we are** indeed profoundly **uncertain about our** ultimate **aims,** then we should recognize that **there is** a **great** option **value in preserving**—and ideally improving—**our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely **is** plausibly **the best way** available to us **to increase the probability that the future will contain** a lot of **value.**

Additionally, all moral theories value their own implementation. The only reason deontology is valuable, for example, is because it causes people to actually treat other people as ends. This is not the fallacy of origin: if morality didn’t value its own application it would cease to guide action and lose normativity. Extinction comes first then because people being a live is a pre-requisite to morality making demands.

**Advantage 2 Economy**

The U.S. aviation sector is rapidly declining in the status quo – terrible service at airports is the root cause. Smith**[[30]](#footnote-30)** 13:

Our airports are terrible, and our airlines find it harder and harder to compete. We've done it to ourselves through shortsightedness, underfunding, and flyer-unfriendly policies. In a CNN poll of 1,200 overseas business travelers who have visited the United States, a full 20 percent of them said they would not visit the US again due to onerous entry procedures at airports, including long processing lines. Forty-three percent said they would discourage others from visiting the US. "The United States risks falling behind Asia, the Middle East, and Europe as the global aviation leader." - Carol Hallett, US Chamber of Commerce counsel n Air Line Pilot magazine I'd say that battle was lost a long time ago. The United States of America may have pioneered commercial aviation, but today the crossroads of global air commerce are places like Dubai, Frankfurt, Istanbul, Seoul, and Bangkok. These are the places - not New York or Chicago or Los Angeles - that are setting the standards. They have the best airports and the fastest-growing airlines, and they offer the most convenience for travelers. Some of their success is owed to simple geography. Dubai, for instance, is perfectly placed between the planet's biggest population centers. It's the ideal transfer hub for the millions of people moving between Asia and Europe, Asia and Africa, North America and the Near East, and so forth. The government of the UAE saw this opportunity years ago, and began to invest accordingly. Today, Dubai airport is **one of the world's busiest, and its airline, Emirates, is now** the world's third-largest in terms of capacity**. The book value of the planes** Emirates **has on order - to say nothing of the 200 widebody jets it already operates -** exceeds the value of the entire US airline industry! Not far from Dubai, Istanbul's Ataturk Airport is poised to become a similar mega-hub. Its hometown carrier, Turkish Airline, in addition to winning numerous service awards, now flies to more countries (94) than any other airline in the world. There's not much we can do about geography. At the same time, there's no excuse for the US aviation sector to have fallen so far. We've done it to ourselves through shortsightedness, underfunding, and flyer-unfriendly policies. Compare for a minute our air travel infrastructure to that of, say, the United Arab Emirates, South Korea, or Germany. It's not even close. Our airports are substandard across a number of fronts; our air traffic control system is underfunded; Customs and Border Protection facilities are understaffed; airline passengers are groped**, taxed, and hassled, to the point where, if that CNN poll is to be believed, millions of them will refuse to visit the country. The government seems to treat air travel as a nuisance, something to be dissuaded, rather than a vital contributor of tens of billions of dollars to the annual economy. And although our physical location may not be ideal as a transfer point, there are still plenty of travelers moving between continents who can and should be patronizing US airports and US carriers - if only we weren't driving them away. For those traveling between Australia and Europe, for example, or between Asia and South America, the US makes - or should make - a logical transfer point. Why can't LAX, JFK, and MIA work the way Dubai, Hong Kong, and Amsterdam do? Hell, we don't even try. American airports simply do not recognize the "in transit" concept. All passengers arriving from overseas, even if they're merely transiting to a third country, are forced to clear customs and immigration, re-check their luggage, pass through TSA screening, etc. It's an enormous hassle that you don't find in most places overseas, where transit passengers walk from one gate to the next with a minimum of fuss. Flying from Australia to Europe, for example, a traveler has two options: He or she can fly: Westbound, via Asia (through Singapore, Bangkok, Kuala Lumpur or Hong Kong) or the Middle East (Dubai, Qatar, Abu Dhabi, etc.), or Eastbound via the US West Coast (via Los Angeles or San Francisco) Even though the distance and flying times are about the same, almost everybody will opt for the westbound option.** The airports are spotless and packed with amenities**; the connections painless and efficient. To change planes at** LAX **or SFO,** on the other hand, a passenger must stand in at least three different lines, be photographed and fingerprinted, collect and re-check his bags, and endure the full TSA rigmarole before slogging through a noisy, dirty, claustrophobic terminal to the correct departure gate. Traveling between Asia and South America, it's a similar story. Europe to Latin America, same thing. Few passengers on these routes will choose to connect in the United States because we've made it so damn inconvenient. Heaven help the poor slob who tries connecting at JFK, which is broken up into eight completely separate terminals. In addition to each of the hassles just mentioned, switching between airlines requires that you leave the building completely and catch a train. We can only guess at how many millions of passengers our carriers lose out on each year because of all this. To add insult to injury, airline tickets in America are taxed to the hilt. Overall flying is a lot more affordable than it has been in decades past, but if it feels expensive, one of the reasons is the multitude of government-imposed taxes and fees. There's an excise tax, the 9/11 Security Fee, the Federal Segment Fee, the Passenger Facility Charges, International Arrival and Departure Taxes, Immigration and Customs user fees, an Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service charge, and so on -- a whopping 17 total fees! Airline tickets are taxed at a higher federal rate than alcohol and tobacco. And now there's a proposal to double the security taxes.

SFO living wage solves – empirics confirm. **WPU 2:**

But despite these natural and geographic advantages, of the region’s three major airports, San Jose has the smallest market share. **In the past twelve months,** SJC served 10.3 million scheduled passengers, compared to **14.0 million served by Oakland International and** 26.1 million at SFO. While th**ese two competing** airport**s** **have both** increased **their** passengers served by more than 19% **since 2002,** SJC **has** lagged behind with **growth of** just 2.8%. **San Jose International Airport** is losing market share (see Figure 1). In a before-and-after study evaluating the effects of the living wage policies and associated training standards enacted at [SFO]San Francisco Airport, UC Berkeley researchers found that employers reported an increase in customer service, as well as improvements in overall work performance and employee morale, The researches concluded that these findings “suggest[ed] that improvements in worker performance were widespread across the airport.”18 San Francisc**o** **and Oakland** Airports **both enjoy** comprehensive **Living Wage policies** **that apply to** virtually all **workers, including** **contractors**. San Jose does not.

Growth in the airport sector is key to the nationwide economy. **Smith[[31]](#footnote-31) 12:**

This study examined more than 75 state and individual airport economic impact studies to obtain direct economic impact data for 272 out of the 490 commercial airports analyzed. A detailed, highly correlated regression analysis was developed that estimated direct impact data for the other airports as needed. These direct impact results were used as input for an IMPLAN economic impact model that produced the multiplier impacts found within the U.S. This analysis found that the 490 commercial airports in the U.S.: Support 10.5 million jobs Create an annual payroll of $365 billion Produce an annual output of $1.2 trillion. These **economic impacts** are a significant contributor to the national economy. Not only do these airports provide vital transportation links that permit the rapid, efficient, and cost‐effective movement of people, goods and services, they account for more than 8 percent of the national GDP and support more than 7 percent of the country’s work force.

U.S. economy is key to global economy. **Forbes[[32]](#footnote-32) 06**

The unfolding U.S. banking crisis is spreading to the entire global financial system, potentially exerting a systemic impact. Thus, the first truly global crisis could emerge, challenging policymakers’ pre-globalization economic toolbox.There is much that remains unknown about the nature of the global economy in the absence of sufficient data and adequate theoretical frameworks. As a consequence, the impact the current crisis may have on the global economy is uncertain. However, past crises have much to say about the likely contagion mechanisms and suggest questions that should be asked during this one. financial contagion. Financial sector contagion takes three forms: **–Counterparties.** [1] There is a direct impact through counterparty channels**. The list of financial institutions liable to be affected includes all but the most isolated and remote financial-service institutions of the world. –Risk perception. The second channel is indirect, via** [2] risk perception**. The problem is many global relationships** evolve[s] day-by-day, resulting in significant **uncertainty about the way** risk spread**s** in the global economy. –[3] Cost of capital**. The price of risk** rises substantially. This affects all asset classes **that are categorized as high risk and can easily have an impact on low-risk asset classes as well. Sectoral contagion. If liquidity shortages last, a systemic impact is likely** in nonfinancial sectors. As has happened over the past few days, this can lead to a substantially increased number of liquidity interventions by central banks and even some treasuries. Arguments then emerge over whether there is a meaningful distinction between “illiquidity” and “insolvency,” signaling policymakers’ anxiety levels. Although the liquidity crunch tends to be local–albeit **with important global inter-linkages**–the demand effect of the crisis is truly global and will affect all open economies. The problem is that the well-tested textbook answer–namely tight fiscal policy coupled with somewhat loose monetary policy–is implausible on the global level. This is due to the lack of an institution that could coordinate such a global-level policy response.In short, the financial crisis could lead to an overall systemic crisis through worsening local credit conditions, as well as through shrinking global real economy demand.

Econ collapse leads to extinction. **Bearden 2k[[33]](#footnote-33)**

History bears out that **desperate nations take desperate actions. Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress** on nations **will have increased** the intensity and number of their **conflicts,** to the point wherethearsenals of weapons of mass destruction (**WMD**) now possessed by some 25 nations, **are almost certain to be released.** As an example, suppose a starving North Korea launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China-whose long-range nuclear missiles (some) can reach the United States-attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, themutual **treaties** involved in such scenarios **will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly.** Strategic nuclear **studies have shown** for decades **that, under such** extreme stress **conditions, once a few nukes are launched, adversaries** and potential adversaries **are** then **compelled to launch on perception of preparations by one's adversary.** The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs. Today, a great percent of the WMD arsenals that will be unleashed, are already on site within the United States itself. **The resulting** great **Armageddon will destroy civilization** as we know it, **and** **perhaps most of the biosphere**, at least for many decades.

And, decline is net worse for the environment Klare ‘8**[[34]](#footnote-34)**

The Downside But there is a downside to all this as well. Most serious is the risk that venture capitalists will refrain from pouring big bucks into innovative energy projects. At an energy forum organized by professional services firm Ernst & Young on October 9, experts warned of a sharp drop-off in alternative energy funding. "The concept of alternative energy has a lot of momentum," says Dan Pickering, head of research for Tudor, Pickering, Holt & Co. Securities in Houston. "But lower oil prices make it harder to justify investment. At $50 a barrel, a lot of that investment will die." [If] governments could also have a hard time coming up with the funds to finance alternative energy projects**.** Moderators at the presidential debates repeatedly asked both JohnMcCain and **Barack** Obama **what programs they would cut in order to finance the massive financial-rescue packages the Bush administration has engineered in order to avert further economic distress. Both insisted that their respective** energy initiatives **would be spared any such belt-tightening. It is highly likely, however, that costly endeavors of this sort** will be scaled backor postponed once the magnitude of the financial rescue effort becomes apparent. The same is true for Europe and Japan, who have also pledged to undertake ambitious energy initiatives in their drive to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. Indeed, leaders of **some** European **Union** countries are calling for a slowdown in efforts to curb emissions of greenhouse gases due to the burgeoning economic crisis. Under a plan adopted by the EU in 2007, member countries pledged to reduce such emissions by 20% below 1990 levels by 2020, which is far more ambitious than the Kyoto Protocol. European leaders are scheduled to implement a detailed plan to achieve this goal by December of this year. But at a rancorous summit meeting of the EU heads of state in mid-October, Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi of Italy and the leaders of some Eastern European countries indicated that due to the current crisis, they were no longer able to finance the high costs of attaining the 2020 goal and so weren't prepared to adopt a detailed plan. "We don't think this is the moment to push forward on our own like Don Quixote," Berlusconi declared at the summit. "We have time." At some point, the price of gasoline will fall so low that many drivers will once again engage in the wasteful driving habits they may have given up when the price of gas soared over $3 per gallon. This may not occur right away. But with crude oil at $70 per barrel, half of what it was in August, a corresponding drop in the price of refined products will eventually follow. And that could lead people to see cheap gasoline as the one bright spot on an otherwise dismal horizon. It's unclear at this point whether the crisis will do more good or more harm for the environment. In the short term, it will certainly slow the increase in carbon dioxide emissions. It will also cause a delay in developing environmentally hazardous projects like Canadian tar sands. But if the crisis also sets back development of energy alternatives for any significant length of time, it will cancel out any of these positive developments. Many people are waiting and watching what happens in the global financial markets**.**

## Underview-Kritiks

**First,** The role of the judge is to vote for the most desirable policy option. The better policy option is the one better justified by the winning framework on the post-fiat level. The judge is solely concerned with the outcomes of the policy, not the policymaker’s discourse, my discourse, or representations of the policy.

a) Policy education and practices like fiat are key to social change: state institutions aren’t ignorable, and simply pointing out problems isn’t enough. **Themba-Nixon 2k**[[35]](#footnote-35)

 Getting It in Writing Much of the work of framing what we stand for takes place in the shaping of demands. By getting into the policy arena in a proactive manner, we can take our demands to the next level. Our demands can become law, with real consequences if the agreement is broken. After all the organizing, press work, and effort, a group should leave a decisionmaker with more than a handshake and his or her word. Of course, this work requires a certain amount of interaction with "the suits," as well as struggles with the bureaucracy, the technical language, and the all-too-common resistance by decisionmakers. Still, if it's worth demanding, it's worth having in writing-whether as law, regulation, or internal policy. From ballot initiatives on rent control to laws requiring worker protections, organizers are leveraging their power into written policies that are making a real difference in their communities. Of course, policy work is just one tool **in our organizing arsenal,** but it is a tool we simply can't afford to ignore. Making policy work an integral part of organizing will require a certain amount of retrofitting. We will need to develop the capacity to translate our information, data, and experience into stories that are designed to affect the public conversation [and]. Perhaps most important, we will need to move beyond fighting problems and on to framing solutions that bring us closer to our vision of how things should be. And then we must be committed to making it so.

Policy-making paradigm is the most educational **Keller**[[36]](#footnote-36)

Policy practice encompasses **social workers' "**efforts to **influence the development, enactment, implementation, or** assess**ment of** social policies" (Jansson, 1994, p. 8). Effective policy practice involves analytic activities, such asdefining issues, gathering data, conducting research,identifying and prioritizing policy options, and creating policy proposals (Jansson, 1994). It also involves persuasive activities intended to influence opinions and outcomes, such as discussing and debating issues, organizing coalitions and task forces, and providing testimony. According to Jansson (1984, pp. 57-58), social workers rely upon five fundamental skills when pursuing policy practice activities:     \* value-clarification skills for identifying and assessing the underlying values inherent in policy positions;     \* conceptual skills for identifying and evaluating the relative merits of different policy options;     \* interactional skills for interpreting the values and positions of others and conveying one's own point of view in a convincing manner;     \* political skills for developing coalitions and developing effective strategies; and     \* position-taking skills for recommending, advocating, and defending a particular policy. These policy practice skills reflect the hallmarks of critical thinking (see Brookfield, 1987; Gambrill, 1997). The central activities of critical thinking are identifying and challenging underlying assumptions, exploring alternative[s] ways of thinking and acting, and arriving at commitments after a period of questioning, analysis, and reflection (Brookfield, 1987). Significant parallels exist with the policy-making process--identifying the values underlying policy choices, recognizing and evaluating multiple alternatives, and taking a position and advocating for its adoption. Developing policy practice skills seems to share[s] much in common with developing capacities for critical thinking.

Debate’s a forum designed to solve real world problems. Hingstman 83**[[37]](#footnote-37)**

Lest we believe that such intellectual commitments are limited to the hypothesis-testing paradigm, consider what Dan Rohrer argued about the nature of debate and reality in his essay "Debate as a Liberal Art."58 He submits that **the true skills of argumentation are those of reasoning to develop** logical **means of changing** conviction and **belief**. He sees **debate [arises]** as arising **from the needs of a democratic society that faces** rapid changes and external **challenges that pose policy questions not yet resolved. Audiences in democratic societies inevitably will be moved to action and therefore must be persuaded to choose good alternatives** by those who have expertise. Rather than producing certainty, debate is an art that produces approximations to "truth" within realms of probabilistic speculation. Three factors help to account for the kind of truth that emerges from policy debate: policy adapts to change, argumentation reveals knowledge, and truth is often relative in policy questions. The contingent nature of knowledge and truth as applied to **the necessity for action within the policy-making model** engenders presumption, probability, and predictability as standards of argument evaluation. Thus the policy-making model according to Rohrer's view combines elements of skepticism, relativism, pragmatism and materialism to justify its commitment to **[makes] argument** as **a means of directing inevitable action on social problems.**

**b)** Alternate roles militarize the debate-space. Every single thing we do in and out of round becomes subject to criticism. That destroys debate as a protected space for critical thinking. **Coverstone 95**[[38]](#footnote-38)

Yet, Mitchell goes too far. In two important areas, his argument is slightly miscalibrated. First, Mitchell underestimates the value of debate as it is currently practiced. **There is great**er **value in the** somewhat **insular nature of our** present **activity** than he assumes. **Debate's inward focus creates an unusual space for training and practice with the tools of modem political discourse. Such space is largely unavailable elsewhere in American society.** Second, Mitchell overextends his concept of **activism**. He argues fervently for mass action along ideological lines. Such a turn **replaces control by society's information elite with control by an elite all our own.** More than any other group in America today, practitioners of debate should recognize the subtle issues upon which political diversity turns. Mitchell's search for broad themes around which to organize mass action runs counter to this insight. As a result, Mitchell's call for **an outward activist turn threatens to subvert the very values it seeks to achieve.**

c) My interp is most fair a) Strategy-Kritiks kill 100% aff ground since none of my offense was predicated on the representation or discourse of the 1AC. Means I’m forced to do a 1ar restart which is awful for my strategy since my strat was premised on the ac, plus it gives you a 13-7 time advantage. B) ground-gives the neg quantitatively more ground since in addition to proving the policy bad they get reps, discourse, etc.. Equal distribution of ground key to in round competitive equity since it's the basis on which we make arguments. And, my role of the ballot solves your offense. You could say that policymakers would use poor discourse when they push for the aff, like the link to the politics DA. You get your K impacts and I get my aff. Most reciprocal.

2) My interpretation is that the neg must accept the aff choice of role of the ballot.

You will violate if you impact offensive arguments to some other question, that includes Ks or discourse arguments, or if you make any sort of pre-fiat appeal.

The **A** point is substance: letting the aff choose the framework forces substantive engagement with all of these positions: the norm of aff choice means that we get the benefit of their preferred framework when they affirm. It also turns arguments about how their form of debate is better since it forces it to happen, otherwise people just make role of the ballot arguments and never engage, empricially verified by the fact that most K debate comes down to procedurals.

**B** is strat skew: the aff must pick a role of the ballot by speaking first and devote six minutes to generating offense under it, but the neg can always moot that by starting a debate about the ballot so affs are always behind, this is worse than other preclusion because the methodological starting point frames all offense – I can’t weigh anything in the AC against those claims whereas I can against most NC preclusion. Key to in round competitive equity since we need to be able to formulate a strategy to win. In round competitive equity is a voter since it is a gate way issue, it frames your evaluation of substantive issues as skews prevent you from determining who won the round substantively.

And, in round competitive equity precludes any other impact:

**1.** In round competitive equity is a constitutive part of debate as per the voter so it comes prior to the ability of the judge to evaluate what they want to do outside the space, it’s an intrinsic feature of judging, which is what the judge has committed to in this context

2. Theory questions whether or not s/he ought to have access to the arguments in the first place, if not, then it doesn’t make sense to weigh it against the shell, it begs the question of their legitimacy

3. From the voter, in round competitive equity is a gateway issue, so its a side constraint on evaluating any layer: even if their approach is good, if that layer of the debate is unfair then judges can’t decide who won it. Absent competitive equity he can’t even get access to other arguments in order to weigh them since there’s no way for the judge to evaluate anything that skews equity.

4. Theory just says there’s a specific issue with the way it’s being run in this round, so none of their arguments about why their position is good apply. My impact is to better debate under their model, norm setting means it’s much bigger impact than this round would have otherwise

**5. Engagement**: In round competitive equity preserves the possibility of engaging the position, which means it actually gets discussed. Inequity means the only option is to preclude it, since you can’t realistically win on it. Turn their arguments since we only get benefits from discussing it, and fairness is key to that.

**6. Inclusivity**: a model of debate without competitive equity kills the incentive for people to debate in the first place. That link turns all their offense since there’s no incentive to do work, read and come to tournaments to learn anything. **Speice and Lyle**[[39]](#footnote-39)

As with any game or sport, creating a level playing field that afford[ing]s each competitor a fair chance of victory is integral to the continued existence of debate as an activity. If the game is slanted toward one particular competitor, the other[s] participants are likely to pack up their tubs and go home, as they don’t have a realistic shot of winning such a “rigged game.” Debate simply wouldn’t be fun if the outcome was pre-determined and certain teams knew that they would always win or lose. The incentive to work hard to develop new and innovative arguments would be non-existent because wins and losses would not relate to how much research a particular team did. TPD, as defined above, offers the best hope for a level playing field that makes the game of debate fun and educational for all participants.

## Underview-Theory

**1)** There is a side bias against the aff- the neg won 8 percent[[40]](#footnote-40) more rounds at octas and quarters bids this year. Prefer statistics since they take into account all factors leading to the side bias, so any logical argument for why the aff should have an advantage is empirically denied. This means you reject theory not weighed against the side bias, since something I do that is slightly abusive is actually good because it just corrects for the side bias.

**2)** No 2NR theory or metatheory-a) It skews my time because the I only have 3 minutes to respond to 6 minutes so he has more time on the theory debate b) no judge will vote on a 2ar rvi so it’s a no risk issue that can eat up the little amount of time I have. If we each spend a minute on theory the skew will be 5-2 which is worse than 6-3. **And,** no 2NR RVIs – they could always collapse to theory in the 2N with long scripts I couldn’t have predicted since the justification wasn’t there when I made my choice, that’s strat skew.

3) Conceded aff arguments outweigh (conceded) neg arguments since temporally they came first. Also key to clash by forcing neg to answer aff arguments.

4) Theory on AC spikes is a reason to prefer your interp and reject a spike, not a reason to drop the debater. This is most logical since an interp that indicts an AC spike only justifies why that spike is a bad norm, not the fact that the spike being run is proactively bad. Additionally, that would be terrible since every debate would come down to theory framing issues- he could read “competing interps bad” theory- , meaning we’d never engage in actual theory debates.

5) On T reevaluate my offense under their interp – **A.** Competing mutually exclusive interps force the to be subject to some shell every round, which creates free, no-risk NC preclusion. I have to pick an interp, so don’t punish me for going into the round blind. **B.** I can’t read T on the neg so it’s irreciprocal if they can win on it, it’s a layer I can’t have offense on that can be made to outweigh any theory argument. Reevaluating offense solves since T is no longer something they can win on. **C.** T or theory as a reason to drop the debater uniquely advantages the neg since the fact that the NC is longer than the 1ar means I’m forced to cover the shell since I lose if I don’t, and he can always not go for it. If we each spend 1:30 on that debate he gets an advantage since 5:30-2:30 is worse than 7:40. This means neg theory is drop the argument.

6) Evaluate T through reasonability with a brightline of being the definition used in a study even if it’s not the best: that’s key to check back infinite T interps and indicates that I made an effort to be T so it’s unfair to punish me for what I had no control over. Also means neg abuse is marginal at best – if it’s in a review of living wage policies that means it’s what at least some of the lit talks about and what studies refer to.

7) Aff theory is a reason to drop the debater since the 1ar is only four minutes which is not enough time to win both substance and theory. I need drop the debater or he can be abusive and force me to waste more time than I can afford just getting back to an even playing field.

# FRONTLINES

## Theory

##### A2 T-Plural

*1.     I meet- normal means is local governments enacting the federal mandate, so the plan defend multiple governemnts requiring a living wage.*

*2.     I meet- the bill is renewed over time to adjust for inflation, so multiple governments over time enact the bill*

Counter-interp: The aff may fiat the action of only one actor if a) that actor mandates the implementation of a living wage in multiple states b) there is a solvency advocate who defends that actor doing the plan and c) the plan text is disclosed on the wiki.

1.     **Ground**: a) You explode PIC ground- if I have to defend multiple actors in my plan text they can defend all of them except for one. That’s bad since it moots aff constructive ground which exacerbates 1ar time skew and kills clash, key to education for creating discussion.

2. **Debatability:** The meaning of a living wage varies by country, methodological differences mean they’re incomparable. **Guzi ‘13[[41]](#footnote-41)**

The income level necessary to secure a decent standard of living is an important economic yardstick of income adequacy. A living wage is defined as a wage paid for a standard working week that meets the basic needs of workers and their families and provides some discretionary income. The need for a living wage has also been recognized by the international community. In 1919 the International Labor Organization (ILO) has defined a living wage as a basic human right under their conventions and recommendations to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article 23 (ILO, 2008). In 1948 the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights officially recognized the need for workers to receive a living wage. There was never a consensus on how to define a living wage but in **the** recent decades governments, municipalities, international and local trade unions, and labor research institutes developed their own definitions and measurement methods of a living wage. Debates have appeared in different fora about how best to calculate this standard in a given context. Anker (2011) is the most comprehensive review on how the living wage has been described, defined and measured around the world. In many countries, the concept of living wage is based on a number of different definitions. Different methodological approaches make it difficult to produce a globally comparable living wage. Moreover, the estimation of living wage hinges on the availability of timely information about the cost of living, which is seldom available in developing countries. Anker (2011) argues that greater clarity with regards to the definition and measurement of living wage is a prerequisite for the widespread consideration of living wages and employee needs, by companies, unions and governments.

There is no consistent meaning of a living wage, so your interp is undebatable since we don’t even know what we’re talking about. And, if the aff is winning under one nation’s conception the neg is winning under a different conception there’s no way for the judge to resolve who wins. Resolvibility key since every debate needs a winner. Debatability is key to fairness and education and outweighs other standards because whether your interpretation is best is irrelevant if we can’t access that interp in round.

3) Policy education-Only my interp is consistent with what policy makers do-there is no policy maker that can act for multiple governments. Policy making education is key **Keller**[[42]](#footnote-42)

Policy practice encompasses **social workers' "**efforts to **influence the development, enactment, implementation, or** assess**ment of** social policies**" (Jansson, 1994, p. 8).** Effective policy practice involves **analytic activities, such as defining issues, gathering data, conducting research, identifying and** prioritizing **policy** options, and creating policy proposals (Jansson, 1994). It also involves persuasive activities intended to influence opinions and outcomes, such as discussing and debating issues, organizing coalitions and task forces, and providing testimony. According to Jansson (1984, pp. 57-58), social workers rely upon five fundamental skills when pursuing policy practice activities:     \* value-clarification skills for identifying and assessing the underlying values inherent in policy positions;     \* conceptual skills for identifying and evaluating the relative merits of different policy options;     \* interactional skills for interpreting the values and positions of others and conveying one's own point of view in a convincing manner;     \* political skills for developing coalitions and developing effective strategies; and     \* position-taking skills for recommending, advocating, and defending a particular policy. These policy practice skills reflect the hallmarks of critical thinking (see Brookfield, 1987; Gambrill, 1997). The central activities of critical thinking are identifying and challenging underlying assumptions, exploring alternative[s] ways of thinking and acting, and arriving at commitments after a period of **questioning,** analysis, and reflection (Brookfield, 1987). Significant parallels exist with the policy-making process--identifying the values underlying policy choices, recognizing and evaluating multiple alternatives, and taking a position and advocating for its adoption. Developing policy practice skills seems to share[s] much in common with developing capacities for critical thinking.

4) You overlimit -if we can’t spec a country literally every round will be the same whole rez aff. kills all education since we learn nothing from a debate we’ve had over and over again and is unfair a) you get multiple different counterplans so its only reciprocal that I get multiple plans and b) its empirically verified that speccing specific plans solves time skew-see policy debate where there’s a time skew but no side bias.

###### A2 Grammar

1. No impact, topicality is a question of fairness and education. Generic reasons why grammar is key to a certain standard must be contextualized in terms of this specific interp-even if grammar is generally key to predictability, if my interp is predictable its moot.

2. No, its not an independent voter. You say fairness is a gateway issue, this means we need to interpret the resolution in the most fair way even if its not perfectly grammatical.

3. Different people speak English differently and language only has meaning as its used, so having formal grammatical rules makes no sense.

4. The plan is just the enforcement mechanism for plural local governments to adopt the plan, so I’m consistent with just governments, plural. Plural is clearly a legitimate grammatical interpretation, it doesn’t refer to all governments. I can say states have legalized gay marriage even if all haven’t.

5. Grammar doesn’t make sense in the context of plans-unless he wins plans bads for my plan to be topical it only needs to be a subset of the rez, not prove it true.

###### A2 Phil Ed

1. Non-unique, we can have abstract philosophical arguments for why a single actor should do something. No tradeoff since you need contention level arguments regardless of whether I spec or not.

2. Turn: You stop people from reading certain frameworks that require specing a country, such as constitutionality and consequentialist frameworks since we can’t evaluate the consequences of a generic government implementing a living wage. Means you kill phil ed since you prevent us from talking about important philosophical theories.

###### A2 Limits/Predictibility

1. Wiki solves, its been on the wiki for months, not my fault if you’re too lazy to prep it out.

2. Solvency advocate solves, you should have done research and found it. This topic is pretty small, there are only so many plans defended by actual authors.

3. The aff is better for in-round predictability since I have a specific text showing you exactly who implements the policy, preventing me from shifting advocacies in the 1ar. Outweighs, impacts to structural abuse which directly alters win conditions rather than just making it slightly harder to win or lose which things like speed, font size, etc. all affect

4. The overlimits argument outweighs-a) it's a TOC topic that’s really long, so we should err towards a bigger topic b) you way overlimit-literally every aff is the same, its not possible to overlimit more, I at worst slightly underlimit since there are only so many plans with solvency advocates. C) underlimiting is more educational since even if you don’t have prep you can think on your feet and come up with creative arguments but overlimiting kills all education since we can’t learn anything from a debate we’ve had a thousand times.

##### A2 Can’t Spec Group

Overview: The resolution is not the object of evaluation. The topic functions as an umbrella under which the aff forms an advocacy, and the neg can defend any ground outside of the plan. This frames the T debate: even if the topic means all employees, that’s just an outer limit on what the aff do. Prefer this meta-interp of the resolution:

**A.** **Policy AND Ethics Education** – the statement-as-a-whole approach encourages students to think that neither policymakers nor ethicists consider the specifics of a situation when recommending it, which is a flawed approach to either discipline. Picking and debating about specific advocacies allows students to understand the relevance of nuances to each and means more critical thinking on how subtleties impact policy.

**B. Research Incentive**: finding a new *area* of the literature is what motivates continued investigation of literature, which is key for 5 months. If your research just culminates in a new advantage to be outweighed by general DAs, it’s no longer strategic, which means debate is stale for 5 months

**C.** Whole rez is incoherent, which means it can’t be used – the topic includes a variety of contradictory policies in terms of dollar amount and who’s covered, for example, farm workers are subject to different wage laws.

But, even if that’s not correct, these are reasons why a counterinterp that allows for specification are good, so:

**Counterinterp:** A living wage must specify a subset of employees - that’s the distinction between a living and minimum wage. **Spain ‘98[[43]](#footnote-43)**

Living wage, unlike minimum wage, is not a blanket policy that covers all employers and employees in a locality. It often applies to a single industry, such as the service industry or, like prevailing wage legislation, to a set of occupations within an industry, such as janitors and security guards. Despite the differences among the three mandated wage policies, there is a tendency to confuse the terms. For example, a 1996 California ballot initiative that incrementally increased the minimum wage for the entire state over a three-year period from $4.75 in 1996 to $5.75 in 1998 was entitled the "Living Wage Initiative."6 In general, living-wage ordinances are more complex **in nature** than either prevailing-wage or minimum wage legislation, as they have several requirements in addition to the wage level with which employers must comply.

Prefer it:

*1.* ***Precision*** *– distinguishes between related terms in establishing a definition, with an intent to define. Precision outweighs since* ***A.*** *key to clear limits. If people don’t know what terms refer to, then you don’t actually limit the topic at all since people still end up prepping.* ***B.*** *preserving lit based distinctions is key to predictability since that’s how real authors bracket their discussions so how we would from reading lit.*

1. My interp is confirmed by legislation. **Clain 07[[44]](#footnote-44) summarizes Neumark and Adams**

This type of concern stems from basic principles of supply and demand, and the discussion of it in this context mirrors discussions of the impacts of minimum wage laws. However, living wage legislation is generally not the same as minimum wage legislation. A key difference between the two lies in the coverage of the legislation: Living wage legislation generally applies to a limited number of employers whereas minimum wage legislation applies much more broadly.1 Estimates of the numbers of workers covered by living wage legislation are quite modest, around 1 to at most 2% of workers in the lowest quartile of the wage distribution (Neumark and Adams 2003b). The finding is a double-edged sword: Although the numerical magnitude of displaced workers may therefore be small, so too may be the number of workers who directly benefit.

Means a) my interp is most contextual, the resolution is a political question about what governments should do so it makes sense to debate it in the way governments actually use the term. Precludes all other standads since arguments about which definition is best in the abstract are irrelevant if they don’t apply to the specific resolution b) predictibility-if real living wage laws affect some workers, then that’s what we’ll expect to debate about c) real world-your education is completely irrelevant since no one actually discusses implementing living wages using your definition. Controls the internal link into field context, authors write about laws that are implemented. See Neumark and Adams and Reich. Outweighs standards like ground since it's a prerequisite-before we can try to make the topic equitable we need to actually be debating the topic in a relevant way-that’s determined by the field context.

2. Overlimits- if we can’t spec a group literally every round will be the same whole rez aff. kills all education since we learn nothing from a debate we’ve had over and over again and is unfair a) you get multiple different counterplans so its only reciprocal that I get multiple plans and b) its empirically verified that speccing specific plans solves time skew-see policy debate where there’s a time skew but no side bias.

###### **A2 Limits**

1. Wiki solves, its been on the wiki for months, not my fault if you’re too lazy to prep it out.

2. Solvency advocate solves, you should have done research and found it. This topic is pretty small, there are only so many plans defended by actual authors.

3. The aff is better for in-round predictability since I have a specific text showing you exactly who I defend getting what living wage, preventing me from shifting advocacies in the 1ar. Outweighs, impacts to structural abuse which directly alters win conditions rather than just making it slightly harder to win which things like speed, font size, etc. all affect

4. The overlimits argument outweighs-a) it's a TOC topic that’s really long, so we should err towards a bigger topic b) you way overlimit-literally every aff is the same, its not possible to overlimit more, I at worst slightly underlimit since there are only so many plans with solvency advocates. C) underlimiting is more educational since even if you don’t have prep you can think on your feet and come up with creative arguments but overlimiting kills all education since we can’t learn anything from a debate we’ve had a thousand times.

###### A2 Grammar

1. “We should invite our friends over” doesn’t mean *all* of our friends, but exhibits the same form as the resolutional sentence. That’s clearly a grammatical sentence that expresses an intention that’s satisfied by inviting over SOME friends. At worst, both are grammatical.

2. No impact – impacts to topicality are in terms of what we should debate about, which is fairness or education. Even if grammar is key to that, offense needs to be contextualized in terms of the interp. As long as my interp is predictable, it’s moot

3. **Descriptive Grammar**: Different people speak English differently, and grammatical rules track how the language is spoken since it’s not some platonic form. Formal grammatical rules don’t make sense as absolutes in that context. *Also means you should reject grammar as a standard – allows for exclusionarily declaring some ways of speaking “not real English” to win a T debate.*

4. “Living wage” contextualizes what “employers” refers to – when you say “the government should require corporations to pay income tax,” even if employers means all of them, that income taxes only apply to ones that didn’t report a loss determines who’s actually covered.

5. Grammar doesn’t make sense in the context of plans-unless he wins plans bads for my plan to be topical it only needs to be a subset of the rez, not prove it true.

###### A2 Ground

1. turn: You explode neg ground since they can read disads about any sector. Living wages aren’t right for all industries since some rely on cheap labor, so my ground is qualitatively worse. Outweighs your arg since its less likely there are obviously true plans than sectors where it clearly shouldn’t be implemented, because true plans probably would have been passed already.

2. turn: You explode pic ground. You can pic out of literally any group of workers under your interp, which is unfair since it moots all AC offense. Outweighs since you can try to come up with something against a specific plan by applying generics, but there’s nothing I can do once all my offense is picced out of.

3. No abuse: You can just read impact turns. Regardless of whether you have link turn ground we have the same amount of ground-I have my impacts good you have them bad. Not qualitatively worse, proven by the fact that things like dedev win all the time, in policy and LD.

##### A2 T-Require

1. I meet, you can require yourself to do something. Your definition doesn’t explicitly say it has to involve a third party. I could say I’m requiring myself to not cut classes this year.

2. I meet, the law is passed by Congress, who then requires the TSA to pay its employees. More.

3. I meet, not all security workers at airports are TSA, airlines both hire and contract out other workers who are involved in security, just not the ones who screen you as you go through security. The WPU evidence clearly says the plan applies, for example, to contractors. A) You should have clarified, the plan is only talking about them and I’ll only generate offense from those b) at worst the plan is extra-t, but you never give a reason why extra-t is bad. That had to be in the speech in which the shell was run.

## Framework

### Extinction first

1. Moral uncertainty *proven by defense* implies preventing extinction to allow future deliberation- my offense is the only way to prove your moral theory correct. Not a genetic fallacy and doesn’t assume I win framework - if there’s value in doing what morality dictates and moral knowledge is key then there’s value in preventing extinction no matter what framework is true.

2. Prereq- you can't \_\_\_\_\_ if you're dead - you’ll say framework delinks but regardless of what moral theory is true there’s value in promoting accordance with it, else it would be self-defeating, both prescribing behavior and its impossibility.

3. Standards are filters for credence in impacts; winning your ethical theory 60% can't deny 100% of other offense. Even if util/ARC is improbable extinction is an infinite harm as it precludes all experience, while the violation of your standard is finite. *You’ll claim a violation of your standard is also infinite but this is a conflation- just because side-constraints say every harm is the worst doesn’t make them irreversible or preclude all other action*

4. Minimally defensible ethical theories agree humans have basic worth as proven by universal acceptance of life and rights - extinction directly contradicts those. So either a) your ethical theory runs in the face of consensus, which proves the NC’s conclusion false, or b) extinction matters under the NC. This is key since in the face of epistemic peers- if 10 doctors’ diagnosis came to a different conclusion than yours you have reason to question it.

You'll extend calculation indites but

a. these assume other potential util impacts that extinction precludes the chance of

*no calculation necessary- extinction precludes chance of other impacts OR you concede contention*

b. defense at best- and non-applicable when the extinction scenario is conceded

c. One cannot be certain that calc indicts are true so that just lowers the probability that util is true - multiplying any positive numbers gets a positive number, so all the risks that justify my arg persist in the face of this objection.

### Shoemaker takes out \_\_\_\_

Devolves property rights

1- Collapses the concept of *self*-ownership, since there are no separate persons, the concept of a singular person owning something is incoherent

2- Denies importance of acquisition, since the person who acquired the good was a different person. Means states of affairs are more important since that psychological continuity is arbitrary

3- Proves aggregation good - just as owners of property should alter their land if it brings greater profit, society should rearrange property if it’s for the greater good.

Devolves Levinas

1- Proves the concept of the other is incoherent, since there is no moral difference between persons. 2- If half your brain was put into the other, then they would have the same set of experiences and you could understand them. At worst this proves the Other differs only physiologically and still denies your epistemic arguments.

3- Empirically disproves the normative implication- both hemispheres of the brain operate independently of the other and yet they are still able to make the decisions on how the other interacts

Devolves equal freedom

1- Equal freedom says an action wrong when person A interferes with person B’s ability to pursue her own ends. However, if this is true, there are infinite violations of freedom since my past self interfered with the ends my present self can attain. Thus the concept of freedom the neg proposes is incoherent, and the only way to make comparisons of freedom is through weighing magnitude of harms, as util does.

2- Denies the impact of violations. For example, it’s okay to order a first grade child to do her homework since it benefits her in the long run. Similarly, if reductionism is true, restrictions of freedom are justified if they allow such benefits.

3- Implies an intent based standard is incoherent since there is no unifying intent amongst a group of persons, leaving only ends to make the assessment.

### Schwartz Takes Out Stuff

schwartz/nagel/sayre-mccord devolve other frameworks

at property rights

1. prereq. Sayre-McCord shows the ability to say this is my property is contingent upon accepting others’ happiness.

2. means even if generally property is good aggregation is justified since there are definite costs to having your property rights guaranteed. i.e. eminent domain takes away land but is used towards projects that make everyone better off

3. happiness is a more basic good than property- nagel indicates everyone has reason to avoid pain, but lack of consensus on necessity of property means you err towards my framework

at levinas

1. means we can describe the needs of the other, which is a necessary lynchpin in your framework. a) The other would want to avoid pain- that’s Nagel. you’ll say maybe they like it but then the question becomes semantic- there are definitely bad mental states that they’d want to avoid. b) necessary in our reasoning is that we value the other’s happiness- that’s sayre-mccord, proving that we can take into account their needs via preference satisfaction util.

2. Schwartz proves that the only way to validate the other is through experience which requires analysis of mental states

at equal freedom

1. freedom is only evaluated through the filter of end states proving it’s the results not structures that matter

2. willing my own freedom necessarily wills my wish of certain good ends, which bites into Sayre-mccord and requires consequentialism

3. psychologically willing to enter into some relationship of dependence for greater benefits disproving that your conception of freedom is inessential and at best devolves into mine

### Kant Devolves to Util

1. In action, the will necessarily represents the *capacity* for practical reason as to be sustained in action. **Engstrom**:

We have also seen that practical cognition’s consciousness of itself as cognition includes an awareness of itself as self-sustaining, every act of practical cognition being necessarily in agreement with every other as well as with itself. And this a priori consciousness includes the recognition that the capacity for such cognition, as the ground of the necessary agreement among its acts, must be essentially one. Therefore the idea of humanity, which practical cognition necessarily includes in its representation of the subject it cognizes, is the representation of an essentially unitary capacity, whose practical judgments all stand in a necessary agreement with one another that constitutes the unity of practical knowledge, an agreement that also belongs to the actions issuing from them. Being thus recognized as the unitary capacity for self-sustaining practical cognition, humanity is always represented in such cognition as already actual and self-sustaining in and through such cognition itself. As Kant says, it is conceived as “self-standing.” Hence in practical cognition humanity is represented, not as to be produced, but as to be sustained, both in a negative sense (as not to be hindered) and also positively (as to be furthered) so far as practical cognition, as discursively self-determining, is capable of developing and perfecting itself. Thus, in addition to being necessarily represented in the subject position in practical knowledge, humanity is necessarily represented as sustaining itself in and through its own exercise in self-sustaining practical knowledge.[[45]](#footnote-45)

The capacity for practical reason is shared between individuals – just as the capacity to walk is shared by most humans – but it cannot be sustained if it has no bearers. Thus there can be no valid act of practical cognition that understands extinction as its result, since that act could not represent practical reason as sustained. This means extinction always outweighs the failure of any individual to be sustained in an act, since the capacity for practical reason can survive the destruction of any of its bearers, but not all of them. **This is not a genetic fallacy argument** –the claim is not that humans must exist for there to be morality, but rather that because morality is based on the sustained existence of rationality the preservation of rationality per se is always prior to the preservation of any individual rational being.

1. The will necessarily aims both at conformity to the moral law and happiness since the moral law is a condition of practical judgments being cognitions and happiness is a condition of the existence of the agent as a motivated being. But this generates a contradiction in the structure of practical rationality where virtue and happiness conflict. **Kant:**

In the highest good which is practical for us, i.e., to be realized by our will, virtue and happiness are thought as necessarily combined, so that the one cannot be assumed by pure practical reason without the other also being attached to it. Now this combination (like every other) is either analytical or synthetical. It has been shown that it cannot be analytical; it must then be synthetical and, more particularly, must be conceived as the connection of cause and effect, since it concerns a practical good, i.e., one that is possible by means of action; consequently either the desire of happiness must be the motive to maxims of virtue, or the maxim of virtue must be the efficient cause of happiness. The first is absolutely impossible, because (as was proved in the Analytic) maxims which place the determining principle of the will in the desire of personal happiness are not moral at all, and no virtue can be founded on them. But the second is also impossible, because the practical connection of causes and effects in the world, as the result of the determination of the will, does not depend upon the moral dispositions of the will, but on the knowledge of the laws of nature and the physical power to use them for one's purposes; consequently we cannot expect in the world by the most punctilious observance of the moral laws any necessary connection of happiness with virtue adequate to the highest good. Now, as the promotion of this highest good, the conception of which contains this connection, is a priori a necessary object of our will and inseparably attached to the moral law, the impossibility of the former must prove the falsity of the latter. If then the supreme good is not possible by practical rules, then the moral law also which commands us to promote it is directed to vain imaginary ends and must consequently be false.[[46]](#footnote-46)

Since extinction abjures the possibility of happiness where the moral law commands us to extinction the principle undercuts itself by generating a conflict internal to practical rationality and making the motivation to abide by the categorical imperative rationally unsustainable. The motive of happiness cannot be foregone under any circumstances, since an agent is constituted by their having happiness as their aim, since otherwise their actions would have no ultimate guiding purpose. So where the moral law generates this conflict, as with extinction, default to sustaining happiness as the sole active criterion for practical rationality, as a consequence of Kant’s own account of the unity of practical reason.

## Contention

### Inherency

Nah, the plan is still inherent, most workers still don’t get a living wage. **Dietz et al[[47]](#footnote-47)**

In recent decades **the airline industry has seen** a **substantial** increase in outsourcing which has undercut job security and **lowered wages**. **This wage erosion has been particularly dramatic** for private-sector workers employed in ground-based jobs in America’s airports. **The transformation** of self-sustaining middle-class airline careers to low-wage outsourced jobs **not only hurts workers** and their communities, **but** **also** may negatively affect the **safety, security, and efficiency of airports**. Main Findings Outsourcing of baggage porter jobs more than tripled, from 25 percent to 84 percent, while **average hourly real wages** across both directly-hired and outsourced workers **declined by 45 percent**, from over $19 an hour **to $10.60 (in 2012 dollars).** Outsourcing of vehicle and equipment cleaning jobs doubled, from 40 percent to 84 percent, while wages fell from the equivalent of over $15 an hour to $11.40, a drop of 25 percent. Today, even the highest paid outsourced workers in these ground-based airport occupations earn less in real terms than the average directly-hired worker in the same job a decade ago. **More than one-third** (37 percent) of cleaning and baggage workers **at airports, both directlyhired and outsourced, live in or near poverty**. Because of low wages and benefits, a similar share of these workers and their families must rely on public benefit programs to make ends meet. **Average weekly wages in the airport operations industry** generally (excluding air traffic control) **did not keep up with inflation, but fell in real terms by 14 percent from 1991 to 2011**. Wages for these workers not only grew more slowly than the average rate across all industries, but also grew more slowly than wages in the low-paying food services and retail industries. In 2011, workers in airport operations made an average of $545 a week.

### A2 Das/Turns

##### A2 Increases Unions, that’s bad

1. Non-unique, the TSA is already unionized. **Edwards[[48]](#footnote-48)**

**The** recent **unionization of** TSA**’s** work­force could make effective management even more difficult. The Bush administra­tion blocked attempts to unionize **TSA** workers; TSA administrator Admiral James Loy argued in 2003 that “collective bargain­ing is not compatible with the flexibility re­quired to wage the war against terrorism.”35 The Obama administration, however, has been very pro-union, and it pushed to cover TSA workers with collective bargaining. In 2010, the Federal Labor Relations Authority ruled that TSA workers should be allowed to vote on a union, and in February 2011 TSA approved an election for the exclusive rep­resentation of TSA’s nonsupervisory work­ers.36 Later that year, the American Federa­tion of Government Employees (AFGE) was approved as the monopoly union for TSA. In 2012, AFGE and TSA signed a collective bar­gaining agreement covering 44,000 employ­ees after very contentious negotiations.37

2. Turn: Implementing the living wage would decrease participation in unions because people will be content with the living wage reform. **Luce 05**[[49]](#footnote-49) summarizes

The link between union organizing and the living wage is complex. Although some living-wage opponents claim that unionization efforts are the main motive behind the movement, not all union leaders are convinced of the opportunities for translating living-wage campaigns into new organizing. In fact, some assert that the campaigns hurt organizing efforts: If workers can get higher wages through legislation, why would they fight for a union? The reality is somewhere in between. Ken Jacobs, head organizer for the San Francisco living-wage campaign, argues that where unions have been strategic about involvement in campaigns, they have seen positive results. Where unions are neutral or even skeptical of the campaigns and stay out of them, living-wage ordinances can in fact be a detriment to new organizing. Unfortunately for unions, Taft-Hartley states that city governments cannot require employers to have unions or even that employers abide by card-check and neutrality agreements to get a city contract (Sahu, 2001).

3. Your link and impacts are empirically denied-in the airports with living wages TSA performance went up not down, that’s all the evidence in the aff., plus SFO workers didn’t suddenly unionize.

DON’T READ WITH 2 4. Turn: Unionized security workers are preferable. **SEIU ‘10[[50]](#footnote-50)**

**When officers form a union, they have the ability to solve workplace problems, which increases morale and decreases turnover. Security officers work through their union** to win decent wages and fair treatment, **which leads to** a sense of **pride, loyalty and cohesion** among officers. When officers are treated as security professionals, both **performance and longevity increase--**with obvious benefits for clients. **Officers who stay on the job** understand their workplaces better and **are better prepared to respond quickly and effectively** **to problems** that arise. These officers spend enough time on-site to learn their role thoroughly and build strong relationships with employees and guests. Experienced officers have the confidence of knowing who should be on the premises and who should not.

##### A2 Costly to travelers/airlines

1. The airlines save anything extra they pay from ways in which the plan lowers expenses, but even if it didn’t the cost would be negligible. **Reich ‘03**

**The cost of the** QSP and **living wage** ordinance to airlines and airport travelers **amounted to** about $**1.42 per passenger.** The direct cost of the QSP to employers consists of increased wages, payroll taxes, health benefits, paid time off and training costs. These costs approximate $42.7 million a year. **Including the spillover effects** to other workers and employers at SFO adds $14.9 million to employers’ costs. The total cost amounts to 0.7 percent of the fare revenue received at SFO in one year. **If the airlines passed these costs directly** to the customers, **the** cost **increase would average $1.42 per airline passenger**. **This** cost estimate **does not take into account** any savings from **increased productivity and other employer savings**. 5. Adjustments that reduced business costs and improved service quality **Following implementation** of the QSP, **workers and firms adjusted** their **behavior in ways that reduced its costs** **Turnover fell by** an average of **34 percent** among all surveyed firms and 60 percent among firms that experienced average wage increases of 10 percent or more. **The greatest reduction** in turnover occurred **among airport security screeners**, from 94.7 percent a year in April 2000 to 18.7 percent fifteen months later, an 80 percent decrease. Cabin cleaning firms reported a 44 percent reduction in turnover, and ramp workers a 25 percent reduction. · **Reduced turnover** **saved employers $ 6.6 million per year**. Every time an average worker has to be replaced employers pay about $4,275 in turnover costs. The turnover reductions therefore saved employers $ 6.6 million each year.

2. No impact-its empirically verified that more passengers went to SFO after the plan was implemented, not less, so any increase in cost has a negligible impact.

3. **Zillman summarizes Tilly and Jacobs[[51]](#footnote-51)**

How and why? Mainly, it’s the “importance of being unimportant,” says Chris Tilly, director of UCLA’s Institute for Research on Labor and Employment. Labor costs, as part of overall airline costs, are very low, meaning pay hikes make only a minimal dent in airlines’ bottom line, says Ken Jacobs, chair of the Labor Center at UC Berkeley. And the cost of increasing airport workers’ wages can easily be passed on to travelers — a captive audience in the isolated economy of an airport terminal, where normal rules about market competition don’t necessarily apply. If employers passed on all additional labor costs through price increases, the roughly 16 million passengers traveling through Sea-Tac Airport every year would only see an average increase of $1.78 in combined ticket, food, and retail prices, according to a report by Puget Sound Sage, a coalition of labor, faith, and community organizations that supports the Sea-Tac wage initiative. Th**e** average air travel trip from Seattle costs consumers $363.

##### A2 Enforcement Costly

Municipalities as the actors solve—a living wage enforced by municipalities would have little to no effect on local budgets. **EPI 06[[52]](#footnote-52)**

Living wage laws have small to moderate effects on municipal budgets. • A detailed survey of 20 cities found that the actual budgetary effect of living wage laws had been consistently overestimated by city administrators; actual costs tended to be less than one-tenth of 1% of the overall budget. • Two separate studies of the Baltimore living wage found that city contract costs increased less than the rate of inflation. • A study of the Los Angeles ordinance found no measurable effect on the city’s fiscal health. • A study of living wage ordinances in three New England cities found that contract costs only rose in one city. • Multiple studies have shown that the bidding for municipal contracts remained competitive or even improved as a result of living wage ordinances.

The cost of local living wage laws are overestimated—the resulting figure is much lower. **EPI 2**

Even cities budgeting for a new living wage policy have systematically overestimated the ultimate cost of the policy. Elmore’s survey of cities that have enacted living wage laws shows that all of the cities that created budget forecasts significantly overestimated the actual costs of implementation. Actual costs ended up being between 30%-52% lower than what was forecast by the municipal government (Elmore 2003, 8). To most accurately reflect the likely cost of the policy, prospective studies need to acknowledge, at bare minimum, that municipal governments will not bear all of the cost of a living wage, and most likely will experience only relatively small budget impacts.

##### A2 Ptx

1. The plan specifically faces less resistance-ignore their generic ev. **Zillman ‘13[[53]](#footnote-53)**

**Airports are run by public officials who are more susceptible to pressure to raise wages** **from** the **labor unions and community groups** that often lead these initiatives **than**, say, **a corporation like**[**Wal-Mart**](http://management.fortune.cnn.com/2013/11/25/walmart-ceo-challenges/)  **which answers to shareholders, not constituents.** **Those factors** **have made it easier for** a string of **airports to implement living wage ordinances**, starting in earnest at San Francisco International Airport (SFO). In 2000 it adopted what it called a Quality Standards Program that established compensation, recruitment, and training standards for airport employees, including a minimum wage of $12.93 per hour.

1. No link, when the justification is stopping terrorism not fighting poverty the plan doesn’t tank pol cap. **Shore 15[[54]](#footnote-54)**

[The New York Times editorialized](http://tinyurl.com/mdokvpf" \t "_hplink) on February 11 that President Obama's request to Congress for formal authorization to conduct war is "indefensibly late." They are referring, of course, to the support **the president is seeking for U.S. military action against ISIS** in Syria and Iraq. Until now the administration has been operating under the dubious authority of authorizations Congress passed in 2001 and 2002. The Iraq War authorization sought by President George W. Bush, based on inaccurate assessments of weapons of mass destruction, has been particularly discredited. What changed for the president and his team was the political calculation. Until now there had been more advantage than disadvantage to acting without formal congressional action. Now, **with an opposition-controlled Congress** elected in November which is capable of making things more difficult for the president, that calculation shifts. **Due to** a different set of **political calculations**, there is another war the administration has been reticent to formally embrace, for reasons that also have to do with a previous president's attempts that were discredited. That is the war on poverty here at home, whose shortcomings during and since President Lyndon Johnson's Great Society programs have made such ambitious efforts unpopular to promote. In his most recent State of the Union address, President Obama didn't speak of poverty at all except in the context of Ebola and extreme global poverty. **There is no question that terrorism** and extremist violence **is a serious threat**. But so is the [extreme poverty and hunger destroying the lives of too many American children](https://www.nokidhungry.org/problem/overview" \t "_hplink). More than 45 million Americans live below the poverty line, and 46 million remain on food stamps, half of them children. A majority of our public school students are from low-income families. There are 14.7 million poor children and 6.5 million extremely poor children in the U.S. today. Among 35 industrialized countries, America ranks 34th in terms of child poverty -- ahead only of Romania. As [Share Our Strength](http://www.nokidhungry.org/" \t "_hplink)'s national spokesperson, Jeff Bridges has said many times, "If another country were doing this to our children, we'd be at war."The president's action in forcing Congress to confront the war on terrorism and act decisively one way or the other is better late than never. One must hope he'll soon do the same for the war on poverty. That battle is more necessary today than at any time since he took office. It is ironic that **fighting poverty** here **at home may require more political capital** and courage **than fighting terrorism** around the world. If the president can ask Congress to set conditions for putting Americans in harm's ways halfway around the world, surely he can ask them to help take our most vulnerable citizens out of harm's way here at home.

2. Turn, Winners win. **Ornstein[[55]](#footnote-55)**

2. Winning comes to those who look like winners. This only sounds redundant or cliche-ish. If power is the ability to make people do something they otherwise would not do, real power is having people do things they otherwise wouldn't do without anybody making them - when they act in anticipation of what they think somebody would want them to do. If a president develops a reputation as a winner, somebody who will pull out victories in Congress even when **he is** behind, somebody who can say, "Do this!" and have it done, then Members of Congress will behave accordingly. They will want to cut their deals with the president early, getting on the winning team when it looks the best and means the most. They will avoid cutting deals with the opposition. Stories that show weakness, indecisiveness, or incompetence in the White House - and there are always lots of them - will go unreported or will be played down because they will be seen as the exception that proves the rule of strength and competence.

3. No link, living wages for smaller amounts of workers aren’t opposed. **Bernstein 05[[56]](#footnote-56)**

**By keeping the coverage** of the ordinances quite **limited in terms of the number of workers whose wages are lifted** by the policy, **living wage campaigns are quite effective at quelling** officials' **concerns** regarding economic problems **caused by the wage mandate**, and, according to the available evidence, **limited coverage appears not to generate significant inefficiencies.**

##### A2 Unemployment

Nah, it doesn’t, prefer because its specific to the plan, even if living wages in general increase unemployment its empirically verified that this one actually increases employment **Reich ‘03**

· **Employment levels did not decline as a result of the** QSP. **Employment in QSP-covered jobs** in the airline and airline service firms **grew by** up to **15 percent** between 1998 and 2001. **The** observed **expansion in employment occurred despite the fact** **that** the effects of **the recession on airport activity were apparent** by the beginning of 2001. Employment at SFO began to decline only after the sharp drop in airport activity subsequent to September 11.

##### A2 Racist/Discriminatory

Nah, it doesn’t, prefer because its specific to the plan, even if living wages in general are discriminatory its empirically verified that this one isn’t **Reich ‘03**

We find some evidence of small displacement effects as a result of the program. The QSP allowed employers to hire screeners with slightly more education, although increased **training mandates and worker protections ensured that few incumbent workers were displaced**. While **the overall proportion of women to men in the SFO workforce did not change**, the QSP did result in more hiring of men than women in certain low-wage occupations. **There is no evidence of changes in hiring patterns by age and race.**

### A2 CPs

##### AT Abolish the TSA

1. Perm, do both. The plan isn’t specific to the TSA, there will always be some airport workers involved in security, whether hired by airlines, airports or the government so the plan still gives them a living wage.

2. Perm, do both. There can still be a requirement to pay a living wage, even if no one gets that living wage. The cp isn’t therefore mutually exclusive and can’t be net beneficial if no one is getting the living wage, since there can’t be a disad to something that doesn't happen.

3. Extend the Goudie evidence, damning concession, this means there are threats now and airline security is key, only the aff has a risk of solving if you get rid of airline security.

###### AT Privatize the TSA

(Probably don’t even need to read, since the perm is just true).

The CP is a ridiculous idea, it would just lead to attacks and more annoyance for passengers. **Atkins ‘14[[57]](#footnote-57)**

But **let's say**, for the sake of argument, that **there were an airline out there that** specifically **chose to appeal to customers** who believed that the security theater of the TSA is all hogwash and were **desperate for a security-free experience**. Theoretically, there might be an economic opportunity there—until **[after] the first incident of hijacking or terrorism aboard a low-security** airline. When that happens, **airlines would** once again **start falling all over themselves to offer** even more stringent security **procedures to appeal to a** very **scared public**. And perhaps, **after a decade** or more, **when the memory** of the most recent devastating tragedy **fades away**, **the cycle would begin again**. The bottom line is that Matthews' suggestion for how we should run security at airports would not create the paradise he desires. Instead, **it would leave us with a privatized hellscape where mass casualty incidents cyclically alter the free-market selling points** that airlines use to attract customers.

##### AT States

1. Permutation: Do both, have both a federal and state requirement, no reason why they are mutually exclusive-redundant federal and state laws exist in the squo. And, perm is better for federalism than the cp **Levin-Waldman ‘14[[58]](#footnote-58)**

Among the topics that often rise to the top of the debate in most national elections is just what the proper relationship is between the states and the national government. In other words, has federal authority usurped state sovereignty, or is more federal authority needed because the states are untrustworthy guardians of individuals’ rights? It would appear that the **many states** that have taken it upon themselves to either **adopt their own minimum wages** or raise existing ones over the federal have only **rekindled the** traditional **states’** rights **v. national** authority **debate**, albeit it in a different form. This form, however, appears to have an ironic twist. It is usually conservatives who argue for states rights as a way of opposing national authority that finds expression in federal policies and unfunded mandates. It is usually liberals that push for national authority over states’ rights on the grounds that a minimum set of uniform standards are required across the country, and that the states cannot be trusted. The same liberals who argue for national authority also push for a higher federal minimum wage. And the same conservatives pushing for a return to states’ rights also tend to oppose increases in the minimum wage. One might think that liberals would oppose state efforts to advance the minimum wage in favor of a higher federal minimum wage. But the failure of Congress to increase the minimum wage and maintain it in lines with the inflation rate has apparently left them with little choice. Because the federal government isn’t maintaining the minimum wage, increasingly more states have come to the conclusion that they need to take matters into their own hands to protect the economic security of their citizens. **Those who argue the virtues** **of** returning to traditional **federalism**, or what some might refer to as the new federalism, where the states assume more responsibility for domestic policy will no doubt **hold these measures as sign of progress**. They might point out that it is **in the states where interesting policy innovations are occurring**, and that in lines with Louis Brandeis’s statement that the states were the “laboratories of democracy,” policy initiatives should always be tried at the state level first. That is because if successful at the state level, **it is ripe to expand it to the federal level**.

States and federal government working together is uniquely good for federalism, also means better policies. Abel ‘08[[59]](#footnote-59)

Several commenters on this series have remarked that my discussion of DNS tracks with former Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, who suggested the states be “laboratories of democracy.” The parallels are evident, but DNS would (ideally) take the “laboratories” metaphor a few steps further. First, DNS would consider more than just the states in percolating solutions; it would allow for innovation in all jurisdictions: cities, counties, regions, etc. Second, rather than rely on a loose-knit series of disconnected laboratories (dispersed nodes), DNS would systematically “connect” or “network” these laboratories with each other and with Washington. Third, **in this system/network, Washington would play an active role:** fostering and encouraging the proliferation of **best practices across the country.** In other words, **if the states are the laboratories, Washington is the incubator that helps them move their experiments outward** to the wider “market**,” sparking a constant cycle of “innovation, evolution and competition”** — what Paul Ormerod identifies as the “**hallmarks of a successful system.”**

Federal action good:

First, federal economic policies such as wage laws are a catalyst for more effective policies in the future. **Bradford, 04** [[60]](#footnote-60)

Controversy persists over the nature and impact of the Clinton urban engagement (Ferguson and Dickens, 1999; Katz and Rogers, 2001). Using 2000 census data, Paul Jargowsky has documented what he calls “stunning progress” in the 1990s in reducing spatially concentrated poverty, particularly among African Americans, and in growing home ownership and minority owned businesses in inner cities (Jargowsky, 2003). Some explain the gains as a byproduct of the national economic boom, while others, such as the Brooking Institution’s urban policy director, Bruce Katz, cite the “**the triumph of smart federal policies**” (Katz, 2003). Regardless, there are now a number of lessons to consider from the American experience. First, the Clinton approach recognized, after decades of contradictory federal interventions in cities, that it **was necessary to try to coordinate aspatial general policies and spatially-targeted measures**. Administration officials proclaimed that neither in isolation was sufficient: strategies for renewing urban infrastructure required appropriate backing by social policy if people were to enter the economic mainstream. Thus, a host of new targeted measures, most prominently the Empowerment Zones/ Enterprise Communities programs and Community Reinvestment regulations, were flanked by increases to the Earned Income Tax Credit, **the minimum wage**, and a more ‘community friendly’ national transportation policy. In the latter case, **large federal investments** in metropolitan transit infrastructure were paralleled by a novel ‘reversing commuting’ program helping poor residents of ghetto neighbourhoods get access to suburban jobs through improved transportation. More broadly, the Livable Communities framework unveiled in the Administration’s final year in office aimed to support many states and cities with their regional ‘smart growth’ strategies. Second, the urban policy activism of the 1990s **contributed to** the consolidation of **a robust community-based development paradigm** that joined actors at different scales in a common discourse (Sirianni and Friedland, 2001; Kingsley et al. 1997). In brief, this paradigm marked a conceptual and practical break with the legacy of the 1960s Great Society programs which were criticized variously for their top-down control, professional dominance, confrontational tactics, and focus on the deficiencies of individuals and problems of communities. Influenced by the ideas of Amarta Sen, John Kretzmann and John McKnight, the new paradigm emphasized building the assets of individuals and the capacities of communities. Under the rubric of Comprehensive Community Initiatives once divergent streams of community activists (most prominently, Community Development Corporations, Industrial Area Foundations, and neighbourhood associations) came together in cities behind multi-sectoral projects. Priorities crystallized around making connections between social, economic and environmental concerns, and also between the inner city poor and regionally dispersed business interests. New alliances emerged in many places ranging from Baltimore’s BUILD, that focused on living wage laws and brownfield renewal, to Silicon Valley’s Joint Venture Silicon Valley, that sought to make technology clusters more socially sustainable. The local networks recognized that extra-local assets were also critical that political outreach to higher governments was necessary for both economic innovation through cluster building and social inclusion through community building (Henton et al., 2004; Harrison and Weiss, 1998). Third, the local formations were substantially assisted in financial, technical, and personnel terms, by a thick layer of national intermediaries such as the Local Initiatives Support Corporation, the National Community Building Network, and the Aspen Institute. With their funding networks and practical toolkits, these organizations have been credited by some as being pivotal in transforming a fragmented array of local development entities and efforts into a national-scale movement capable of delivering, in partnership with governments at all levels, comprehensive community renewal in cities (Gittell and Vidal, 1998). Fourth, the federal government, primarily through the vehicle of a revitalized and refocused HUD, deployed a range of strategies and instruments to assist cities. Community development block grants gave localities considerable latitude in expenditure decisions, but also required inclusive partnerships, citizen participation, and direct support for capacity building in project development. The 1998 Transportation Equity Act used federal money and regulations to enable metropolitan planning organizations to pursue more holistic urban transit approaches sensitive to environmental and social concerns (Edner and McDowell, 2002). Also contributing to multilevel collaboration was the 1995 *Unfunded Mandates Reform Act* that required federal consultation with state and local governments to limit unilateral downloading. Finally, the federal government took a series of steps to ensure its real estate activities and public facilities in cities maximized the developmental spin-offs for troubled neighbourhoods. A Cabinet-level Community Empowerment Board headed by the Vice President was responsible for coordinating the nearly 20 federal agencies active on the urban file. Thus, American public policy in the 1990s featured a significant new urban focus. While not without its problems and limitations, **the federal initiatives supplied both a catalyst and a context for** many **local** **innovations** driven by community alliances with the support of national intermediaries. Whether this legacy survives the different priorities of the Bush administration is uncertain. Concerns from local and state officials about unfunded federal homeland security mandates and micromanagement of welfare reform suggest a return to a more familiar American urban tradition (Herbert, 2002; Katz, 2003a).

##### A2 EITC/UBI/Wage Subsidies

1. Permutation, do both. There is no reason why the cp is mutually exclusive with a living wage. Net benefit to the perm is a risk of a solvency deficit to any of the advantages.

2. I outweigh on probability of solving turnover and fewer mistakes by screeners-its empirically verified that the plan works while the cp hasn’t ever been implemented anywhere, so the chances of the plan solving are always better.

3. You can never solve the turnover link to terrorism-the warrant there is that the living wage at airports provides an incentive to stay in their job. That’s not true if [cp], since workers get the benefits from the cp even if they work elsewhere.

4. CP can’t solve other links to terror either-employee morale uniquely goes up because workers feel better treated by their employers since they’re getting more money, the government giving them money in some form can never solve that. Additionally, plan incentivizes workers to get training so they can preform better at their jobs, cp doesn’t because there’s no extra incentive to keep their job.

5. Cross apply why cp can’t solve turnover, morale, or employee performance-that means it can’t solve econ either.

6. I have a study by UC Berkeley saying the plan helps airports economically, you just have an assertion that it will.

### Impact Frontlines

##### Terror

###### A2 Terrorism Helps Economy

Turn: terrorism hurts the economy-empirically confirmed by many studies **Abadie and Gardeazabal ‘07[[61]](#footnote-61)**

This paper analyzes the effects of terrorism in an integrated world economy. **From an economic standpoint, terrorism has been described to have four main effects** (see, e.g., US Congress, Joint Economic Committee, 2002). First, **the capital stock** (human and physical) of a country **is reduced** as a result of terrorist attacks. Second, **the terrorist threat induces higher levels of uncertainty**. Third, **terrorism** promotes increases in counter-terrorism expenditures, **draw**ing **resources from productive sectors for use in security**. Fourth, **terrorism is known to affect negatively specific industries such as tourism.**1 However, this classification does not include the potential effects of increased terrorist threats in an open economy. In this article, we use a stylized macroeconomic model of the world economy and international data on terrorism and the stock of foreign direct investment (FDI) assets and liabilities to study the economic effects of terrorism in an integrated world economy. The motivation to study the impact of terrorism in an open world economy is the following. It has been documented that the direct impact of terrorist attacks on productive capital is relatively modest. This seems to be true even for events of catastrophic terrorism. For example, Becker and Murphy (2001) estimated that the **September 11th terrorist attacks resulted in a loss** of 0.06 percent of the total productive assets of the US economy. In consequence, after taking into account the four channels mentioned in the previous paragraph, some authors have argued that terrorism is unlikely to exert a significant influence on economic activity in the long-run. The calculations in Becker and Murphy (2001) bound the long-run effect of the September 11th attacks to 0.3 percent of GDP (see also IMF, 2001a and OECD, 2001).2 In contrast, reduced-form estimates of the economic effects of terrorism typically suggest much larger effects, at least in those areas where the risk of terrorism is particularly severe or sustained. For example, in our previous study of **the impact of terrorism in the Basque Country, we find a 10 percent drop** **in per capita GDP** which emerges during a period of 1See Enders, Sandler, and Parise (1992) on the effect of terrorism on tourism. 2 In a more recent paper, Becker and Rubinstein (2004) have argued that terrorism risk may have a large economic impact if the fear of terrorism affects individual utility in each state of nature. 1 wo decades and that is attributable to the terrorist conflict (Abadie and Gardeazabal, 2003). Chen and Siems (2004), Enders and Sandler (1996), and **Pshisva and Suarez** (2006), **among others**, similarly **find large effects of terrorism on economic variables**.3 However, as noted by Becker and Rubinstein (2004), the question of why terrorism may have a large effect on the economy, even if it represents a small fraction of the total economic risk, has attracted much less attention in the academic literature.ism.

###### A2 terror k2 china relations

#### China doesn’t care Tiezzi 14

Can the U.S. and China Cooperate to Fight Terrorism? By Shannon Tiezzi May 03, 2014

As noted in a 2010 Congressional Research Service report, U.S.-China counterterrorism cooperation was at its peak during the early 2000s. Even then, the report described such cooperation as “limited.” During this time, however, “the tone and context of counterterrorism helped to stabilize — even if it did not transform — the closer bilateral relationship” between the U.S. and China, a hint of how cooperation against terrorist activities could increase mutual trust and confidence between Beijing and Washington.¶ Since the heyday of the early 2000s, though, counterterrorism has become less of a bright spot in the relationship. The CRS report notes that in 2005 the U.S. began to publicly express frustration with the amount of U.S.-China cooperation on counterterrorism. As evidenced by this year’s State Department report, these complaints persist today.

No U.S.-China war – economic interdependence and nuclear weapons check. **Zakaria ‘08**[[62]](#footnote-62)

For now, the forces of integration have triumphed, in both Beijing and Washington[‘s]. The Chinese-American economic relationship is one of mutual dependence. China needs the American market to sell its goods; the United States needs China to finance its debt—it's globalization's equivalent of the nuclear age's Mutual Assured Destruction. (And to add to the forces of stability, the Chinese and American nuclear arsenals also act as deterrents.) The reality of a globalized world forces America and China into an alliance that pure geopolitics could never countenance. As a result, the Bush administration has been strikingly accommodating to Beijing over Taiwan. George W. Bush is probably the most ideologically hostile president ever to handle U.S.-China relations. He has spent his entire term in office praising democracy, denouncing dicta­ torship, and promising to use American power to further his goals. But despite all of this, Bush has repeatedly sided with Beijing over Taiwan and warned Taiwan not to attempt seces­ sion, a more anti-Taiwanese statement than any ever made by an American president. That's why, despite Bush's speeches on liberty and his meeting with the Dalai Lama, Beijing is largely content with the administration. On the issue it cares about, Bush has been its ally. B

China would get crushed – the war wouldn’t last **Bandow ‘08[[63]](#footnote-63)**

Which leaves the People’s Republic of China. Beijing, like Russia, should not be considered an enemy. However, it has the makings of a great power, even a superpower, which could ultimately face America as a peer. Moreover, with its influence rising in a region that the U.S. government has grown used to dominating, there is real potential for future conflict. That potential makes the PRC the best excuse for Washington to spend ever more on the U.S. military. There are more than a few advocates of the "China as enemy" thesis, penning articles and books about how Beijing is preparing for, and determined to wage, war against America. There are many more practitioners of what passes for cautious centrism: the PRC could become a threat, so the U.S. needs to enhance its alliances and forces in East Asia. Toss in human rights activists and protectionists, who have other reasons for disliking Beijing, and the anti-China coalition grows. The latest addition to the "China as enemy" literature is the Pentagon’s newly released "Military Power of the People’s Republic of China 2008." In contrast to more fevered attacks on Beijing, this publication is a sober analysis of the PRC’s ongoing defense build-up, which we can see but through a glass darkly. China has announced a 17.6 percent increase in military spending this year, bringing it to $58.8 billion, but that number is incomplete at best and misleading at worst. This uncertainty understandably worries the Pentagon. American military expenditures are outlandish, but they are obviously outlandish. Although Washington does hide intelligence expenditures, it’s hard not to know how many air wings, carrier groups, and armored divisions, as well as foreign bases, the U.S. is funding. But the Defense Department is even more worried that the Chinese are spending too much, which is essentially defined as developing a military which one day could confront American forces – successfully. It’s a fair concern, since Beijing’s military build-up is transforming the international environment far more quickly than most American analysts had expected. The PRC has numerous reasons for seeking to create a superior military. The Pentagon notes that China probably is developing forces for use in such contingencies "as conflict over resources or disputed territories." Moreover, Beijing’s growing "capabilities will increase Beijing’s options for military coercion to press diplomatic advantage, advance interests, or resolve disputes in its favor." As Washington well knows, international political influence is more likely to follow a larger military. Russia has regained regional clout, but remains a smaller global player; Europe is an economic giant but a military midget. Beijing seems intent on twinning soft and hard power to enhance its global clout. Despite the multiple ends, however, the PRC appears to have two more basic goals with its military build-up. The first is to enable the PRC to compel Taiwan, through use of military force, if necessary, to accept some form of reunification. The second is to deter the U.S. from intervening to stop China from using coercion. As the Pentagon observes, "A potential military confrontation with Taiwan, and the prospect of U.S. military intervention, remain the PLA’s most immediate military concerns." Indeed, much of the PRC’s military program seems directed at creating a credible deterrent to America. The Pentagon reports: "China’s nuclear force modernization, as evidenced by the fielding of the new DF-31 and DF-31A intercontinental-range missiles, is enhancing China’s strategic strike capabilities. China’s emergent anti-access/area denial capabilities – as exemplified by its continued development of advanced cruise missiles, medium-range ballistic missiles, anti-ship missiles designed to strike ships at sea, including aircraft carriers, and the January 2007 successful test of a direct-ascent, anti-satellite weapon – are expanding from the land, air, and sea dimensions of the traditional battlefield into the space and cyber-space domains." It’s an impressive list. But America’s military capabilities remain far greater. Why does the PRC need anti-ship missiles for use against aircraft carriers? Because it lacks even one carrier, while the U.S. controls the seas with 12 carrier groups. This country dominates most other military fields as well. America’s nuclear missile arsenal is much bigger, more sophisticated, and more deadly than that possessed by China. Washington already is reaching into space with its missile defense program. Thus, the PRC is seeking to deter America from deploying its more powerful forces. Notes the Pentagon, "Through analysis of U.S and coalition warfighting practices since 1991, Beijing hopes to develop approaches to waging future conflict by adapting and emulating lessons learned in some areas while seeking perceived vulnerabilities that could be exploited through asymmetric means in others." In particular, "As part of its planning for a Taiwan contingency, China is prioritizing measures to deter or counter third-party intervention in any future cross-Strait crisis." Thus, Beijing might be preparing to confront the U.S. But the critical question is, confront the U.S. over what? If Beijing was plotting the conquest of Guam, Hawaii, and ultimately the North American continent, then Beijing’s ongoing military build-up would look dangerous indeed. But there is nothing in China’s long history that suggests such overarching ambitions. Unwilling to remain weak and thus subject to coercion by a trigger-happy superpower across the Pacific. Yes. Determined to vigorously assert its perceived interests. Yes. Expecting international respect and consultation that reflects its increasingly expansive interests and growing power. Yes. Ready to commit global aggression, initiate world war, and wreck both China’s and America’s futures. No. Which means the U.S. should think carefully before responding to China’s ongoing build-up. The Pentagon speaks of a situation which "will naturally and understandably lead to hedging against the unknown," meaning Washington will need to spend even more on the military. If half of the world’s military outlays aren’t enough, one wonders how much would be. Two-thirds? Three-fourths? Even more? Washington should not fret. If the goal is defending America, the U.S. possesses sufficiency today. Just catching up with the U.S. will be a daunting task for the PRC. Explained the Pentagon: "The U.S. Intelligence Community estimates China will take until the end of this decade or longer to produce a modern force capable of defeating a moderate-size adversary. China will not be able to project and sustain small military units far beyond China before 2015, and will not be able to project and sustain large forces in combat operations far from China until well into the following decade." Washington already occupies the global summit, with the enormous military infrastructure of a superpower. China will not easily displace America with the world’s most powerful military. Assume that China, still desperately poor and surrounded by potentially hostile states, decides to deploy one new carrier group a year, no mean task. The PRC still wouldn’t match America until 2020. Even then Beijing wouldn’t be strong enough to take aggressive action against the U.S. homeland or dependencies. To develop an air force capable of dominating U.S. airspace and ground forces capable of invading U.S. territory would be another step well beyond. Most important, the U.S. possesses what would remain an effective nuclear deterrent against almost any imaginable Chinese missile force. It’s not that the PRC couldn’t theoretically construct and deploy more and better nuclear missiles, strategic bombers, and nuclear-armed subs than the U.S., though such a process would take an enormous commitment over many years. But it’s hard to imagine that China could ever deploy enough to create a first strike capability.

###### A2 terrorists don’t want to use nukes

Al-Qaeda still aims to use weapons of mass destruction against U.S., **Warrack ‘10[[64]](#footnote-64)**

**When al-Qaeda's No. 2** leader, Ayman al-Zawahiri, **called off a** planned chemical attack on New York's subway system in 2003, he offered a chilling explanation: The **plot to unleash poison gas on New Yorkers [it] was being dropped for "something better**," Zawahiri said in a message intercepted by U.S. eavesdroppers. The meaning of Zawahiri's cryptic threat remains unclear more than six years later, but a new report warns that **al-Qaeda has not abandoned its goal of attacking the United States with a chemical, biological or** even **nuclear weapon**. The report, by a former **senior CIA official** who led the agency's hunt for weapons of mass destruction, **portrays al-Qaeda's leaders as determined and patient, willing to wait** for years **to acquire the kind of weapons that could inflict widespread casualties**. The former official, Rolf Mowatt-Larssen, draws on his knowledge of classified case files to argue that **al-Qaeda has been far more sophisticated in its pursuit of weapons of mass destruction than** is **commonly believed**, pursuing parallel paths to acquiring weapons and forging alliances with groups that can offer resources and expertise. "If Osama bin Laden and his lieutenants had been interested in . . . small-scale attacks, there is little doubt they could have done so now," Mowatt-Larssen writes in a report released Monday by the Harvard Kennedy School of Government's Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs.

###### A2 No expertise

Terrorists have the expertise Bunn and Wier ‘04 [[65]](#footnote-65)

Several weaknesses of al Qaeda have led some analysts to argue that it could not plausibly carry out an attack with an actual nuclear explosive. First, many of the organization’s recruits have little technical sophistication and expertise. For example, a 1999 **al Qaeda progress report** found in Afghanistan concludes that the attempt to make nerve gas weapons relying on the expertise the group could put together without recruiting specialists had “resulted in a waste of effort and money.” The report **recommended recruiting experts as the “fastest, cheapest, and safest” way to build the capability to make such weapons**. 54 Unfortunately, however, a number of **top al Qaeda personnel are technologically literate** (bin Laden deputy al-Zawahiri is a medical doctor, while reported 9/11 mastermind Khalid Sheikh Muhammad, now in U.S. custody, is **[including] a U.S.-trained engineer**), 55 and **the group has repeatedly demonstrated an ability to carry out sophisticated research in the unclassiﬁed literature**. 56 The most detailed unclassiﬁed analysis of al Qaeda’s nuclear program concludes that it posed a serious threat while it was underway in the Afghanistan sanctuary, and could still succeed elsewhere. 57

###### A2 Al Qaeda too small, etc

Small groups of terrorists are all that’s needed. Bunn and Wier ‘04

Others argue that a group with al Qaeda’s structure of small cells would not be well-suited for what they argue would be a large, long-term project like making a nuclear bomb—particularly given the substantial disruptions al Qaeda has suffered from the international response to the 9/11 attacks. The deaths or arrests of a substantial number of senior al Qaeda leaders and operatives since 9/11, and the other disruptions of its operations, have undoubtedly reduced the probability of al Qaeda succeeding in pulling off a nuclear explosive attack. But the crucial question is: by how much? Unfortunately, as already noted, **the conclusion of repeated technical studies is that the group needed to design and fabricate a** crude **nuclear explosive**, once the needed materials were in hand, **might be** quite small—**as small as a single al Qaeda cell**. **The ability of a cell-based organization** like al Qaeda—**or** even **one of the many loosely afﬁliated regional groups** that now appear to be posing an increasing threat as the old central structure of al Qaeda is weakened—**to make a** crude **nuclear explosive cannot be dismissed**.

###### Nuclear Terror causes extinction

Nuclear terrorism causes extinction. Rhodes 9**[[66]](#footnote-66)**

The response was very different among nuclear and **national security experts** when Indiana Republican Sen. Richard Lugar surveyed PDF them in 2005. This group of 85 experts **judged that the possibility of a WMD** **attack** against a city or other target somewhere in the world **is real and increasing** over time. The median estimate of the risk of a nuclear attack somewhere in the world by 2010 was 10 percent. The risk of an attack by 2015 doubled to 20 percent median. There was strong, though not universal, agreement that a nuclear attack is more likely to be carried out by a terrorist organization than by a government. The group was split 45 to 55 percent on whether **terrorists** were more **likely to obtain an intact working nuclear weapon or manufacture one after obtaining weapon-grade nuclear material.** “The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is not just a security problem,” Lugar wrote in the report’s introduction. “It is the economic dilemma and the moral challenge of the current age. On September 11, 2001, the world witnessed the destructive potential of international terrorism. But the September 11 attacks do not come close to approximating the destruction that would be unleashed by a nuclear weapon. **W**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction **have made it possible for a small nation, or** even a **sub-national group, to kill as many** innocent people **in a day as** national armies **killed in months of fighting** during World War II. “The bottom line is this,” Lugar concluded: “For the foreseeable future, the United States and other **nations will face an existential threat from the intersection of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction.”** It’s paradoxical that a diminished threat of a superpower nuclear exchange should somehow have resulted in a world where the danger of at least a single nuclear explosion in a major city has increased (and that city is as likely, or likelier, to be Moscow as it is to be Washington or New York). We tend to think that a terrorist nuclear attack would lead us to drive for the elimination of nuclear weapons. I think the opposite case is at least equally likely: **A terrorist nuclear attack would** almost certainly **be followed by a retaliatory nuclear strike** **on whatever country we believed to be sheltering the perpetrators**. **That** response **would** surely **initiate a new round of nuclear armament and rearmament** in the name of deterrence, however illogical. **Think of how much 9/11 frightened us**; think of how desperate our leaders were to prevent any further such attacks; think of the fact that we invaded and occupied a country, Iraq, that had nothing to do with those attacks in the name of sending a message.

Current US policy means there would be retaliation Beljac 10**[[67]](#footnote-67)**

Before looking at this issue it would pay to have a look at the Obama administration's policy on the deterrence of nuclear terrorism. **The Obama policy**, which essentially reaffirms Bush era policy, **was articulated in the** 2010 **Nuclear Posture Review.** The 2010 NPR states that **the US will**, **hold fully accountable any state, terrorist group, or other non-state actor that supports or enables terrorist efforts to obtain or use w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction, whether by facilitating, financing, or providing expertise or safe haven for such efforts... The **use of nuclear weapons are not excluded**. In addition, contrary to the National Research Council report, the 2010 NPR states ...In addition, the United States and the international community have improving but currently insufficient capabilities to detect, interdict, and defeat efforts to covertly deliver nuclear materials or weapons—and if an attack occurs, to respond to minimize casualties and economic impact as well as to attribute the source of the attack and take strong action... The above statement encompasses nuclear forensics. The NPR recognises that nuclear forensics is “currently insufficient”, but nonetheless these capabilities are “improving.” That doesn't square with the National Research Council finding that “in some respects” forensic capabilities are “deteriorating.” Given current trends, furthermore, nuclear forensic capabilities will further “decline.” The US deterrence posture is robust, but the nuclear forensic capabilities needed to match declaratory policy are not sufficient and might well decline further, a point to which we return. It is not easy from the above to **appreciate just how robust US nuclear deterrence policy is**. It is not just that a deliberate transfer of nuclear materials by a state to a terrorist group is being deterred through the threat of nuclear attack. The Bush-Obama policy adopts what is **called a “negligence doctrine**.” **If a state is negligent in** its **oversight of nuclear materials,** **and** should **a terrorist group acquire nuclear materials** due to such negligence, **then a nuclear attack upon the negligent state falls within the ambit of the policy**. This is what that seemingly innocuous word, “enables”, in the NPR deterrence policy refers to**.** In the lexicon of US counter-terrorism policy “enables” has a pretty precise meaning. This meaning encompasses negligence. I will have more discussion of this in my book. **A negligence** doctrine is pretty extreme. Such a policy **leaves open any state to nuclear attack if the US decides that that state was negligent** in its oversight over nuclear materials.

##### A2 dedev

Turn: Decline is net worse for the environment Klare ‘8**[[68]](#footnote-68)**

The Downside But there is a downside to all this as well. Most serious is the risk that venture capitalists will refrain from pouring big bucks into innovative energy projects. At an energy forum organized by professional services firm Ernst & Young on October 9, experts warned of a sharp drop-off in alternative energy funding. "The concept of alternative energy has a lot of momentum," says Dan Pickering, head of research for Tudor, Pickering, Holt & Co. Securities in Houston. "But lower oil prices make it harder to justify investment. At $50 a barrel, a lot of that investment will die." [If] governments could also have a hard time coming up with the funds to finance alternative energy projects**.** Moderators at the presidential debates repeatedly asked both JohnMcCain and **Barack** Obama **what programs they would cut in order to finance the massive financial-rescue packages the Bush administration has engineered in order to avert further economic distress. Both insisted that their respective** energy initiatives **would be spared any such belt-tightening. It is highly likely, however, that costly endeavors of this sort** will be scaled backor postponed once the magnitude of the financial rescue effort becomes apparent**. The same is true for Europe and Japan, who have also pledged to undertake ambitious energy initiatives in their drive to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. Indeed,** leaders of **some** European **Union** countries are calling for a slowdown in efforts to curb emissions of greenhouse gases due to the burgeoning economic crisis. Under a plan adopted by the EU in 2007, member countries pledged to reduce such emissions by 20% below 1990 levels by 2020, which is far more ambitious than the Kyoto Protocol. European leaders are scheduled to implement a detailed plan to achieve this goal by December of this year. But at a rancorous summit meeting of the EU heads of state in mid-October, Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi of Italy and the leaders of some Eastern European countries indicated that due to the current crisis, they were no longer able to finance the high costs of attaining the 2020 goal and so weren't prepared to adopt a detailed plan. "We don't think this is the moment to push forward on our own like Don Quixote," Berlusconi declared at the summit. "We have time." At some point, the price of gasoline will fall so low that many drivers will once again engage in the wasteful driving habits they may have given up when the price of gas soared over $3 per gallon. This may not occur right away. But with crude oil at $70 per barrel, half of what it was in August, a corresponding drop in the price of refined products will eventually follow. And that could lead people to see cheap gasoline as the one bright spot on an otherwise dismal horizon. It's unclear at this point whether the crisis will do more good or more harm for the environment. In the short term, it will certainly slow the increase in carbon dioxide emissions. It will also cause a delay in developing environmentally hazardous projects like Canadian tar sands. But if the crisis also sets back development of energy alternatives for any significant length of time, it will cancel out any of these positive developments. Many people are waiting and watching what happens in the global financial markets**.**

Outweighs a) timeframe-economic problems will cause these harms right away, the ev says a goal 5 years from now can’t be reached, while negative impacts of growth won’t be immediate-we’re not about to die this minute. b) specificity-it refers to specific impacts of an economic crisis, not vague generalities about growth. C) author quals, mine is a professor publishing in a peer reviewed journal, so his claims are actually believed by experts who know what they’re talking about.

Human ingenuity and adaptation makes growth sustainable – your authors have been wrong for 60 years Lomborg 12[[69]](#footnote-69)

THE **BASIC** point of The Limits to Growth seemed **intuitive, even** obvious**: if ever-more people use ever-more stuff, eventually they will bump into the planet's physical limits.** So why did the authors get it wrong? Because they overlooked **human ingenuity.¶** The authors of The Limits to Growth named five drivers of the world system, but they left out the most important one of all: people, and their ability to discover and innovate. If you think there are only 280 million tons of copper in the ground, you'll think you'll be out of luck once you have dug it out. But talking about "known reserves" ignores the many ways available resources can be increased.¶ Prospecting has improved, for example. As recently as 2007, Brazil found the Sugar Loaf oil field off the coast of São Paulo, which could hold 40 billion barrels of oil. Extraction techniques have also been improving. The oil industry now drills deeper into the ground, farther out into the oceans, and higher up in the Arctic. It drills horizontally and uses water and steam to squeeze out more from existing fields.¶ And shale gas can now be liberated with new fracking technology, which has helped double U.S. potential gas resources within the past six years. This is similar to the technological breakthrough of chemical flotation for copper, which made it possible to mine ores that had previously been thought worthless, and similar to the Haber-Bosch process, which made nitrogen fixation possible, yielding fertilizers that now help feed a third of humanity.¶ Aluminum is one of the most common metallic elements on earth. But extracting it was so difficult and expensive that not so long ago, it was more costly than gold or platinum. Napoleon III had bars of aluminum exhibited alongside the French crown jewels, and he gave his honored guests aluminum forks and spoons while lesser visitors had to make do with gold utensils. Only with the invention of the Hall-Héroult process in 1886 did aluminum suddenly drop in price and massively increase in availability. Most often, however, ingenuity manifests itself in much less spectacular ways, generating incremental improvements in existing methods that cut costs and increase productivity.¶ None of this means that the earth and its resources are not finite. But it does suggest that the amount of resources that can ultimately be generated with the help of human ingenuity is far **beyond** what human consumption requires. This is true **even** ofenergy, which many think of as having peaked. Costs aside, for example, by itself, the Green River Formation in the western United States is estimated to hold about 800 billion barrels of recoverable shale oil, three times the proven oil reserves of Saudi Arabia. And even with current technology, the amount of energy the entire world consumes today could be generated by solar panels covering just 2.6 percent of the area of the Sahara.¶ Worries about resources are not new. In 1865, the economist William Stanley Jevons wrote a damning book on the United Kingdoms coal use. He saw the Industrial Revolution relentlessly increasing the country's demand for coal, inevitably exhausting its reserves and ending in collapse: "It will appear that there is no reasonable prospect of any release from future want of the main agent of industry." And in 1908, it was Andrew Carnegie who fretted: "I have for many years been impressed with the steady depletion of our iron ore supply. It is staggering to learn that our once-supposed ample supply of rich ores can hardly outlast the generation now appearing, leaving only the leaner ores for the later years of the century." Of course, his generation left behind better technology, so today, exploiting harder-to-get-at, lower-grade ore is easier and cheaper.¶ Another way to look at the resource question is by examining the prices of various raw materials. The Limits to Growth camp argues that as resource constraints get tighter, prices will rise. Mainstream economists, in contrast, are generally confident that human ingenuity will win out and prices will drop. A famous bet between the two groups took place in 1980. The economist Julian Simon, frustrated by incessant claims that the planet would run out of oil, food, and raw materials, offered to bet $10,000 that any given raw material picked by his opponents would drop in price over time. Simons gauntlet was taken up by the biologist Ehrlich and the physicists John Harte and John Holdren (the latter is now U.S. President Barack Obama's science adviser), saying "the lure of easy money can be irresistible." The three staked their bets on chromium, copper, nickel, tin, and tungsten, and they picked a time frame of ten years. When the decade was up, all five commodities had dropped in price, and they had to concede defeat (although they continued to stand by their original argument). And this was hardly a fluke: commodity prices have generally declined over the last century and a half (see Figure 2).¶ In short, the authors of The Limits to Growth got their most famous factor, resources, spectacularly wrong. Their graphs show resource levels starting high and dropping, but the situation is precisely the opposite: they start low and rise. Reserves **of zinc, copper, bauxite (the principal ore of aluminum), oil, and iron** have all been going spectacularly up (see Figure 3).¶ MORE, MORE, MORE¶ WHAT OF the other factors in the analysis? Their devastating collapse was predicted to occur just after 2010, so it may be too soon for that to be definitively falsified. But the trends to date offer little support for the gloom-and-doom thesis.¶ The growth in industrial production per capita to date was slightly overestimated by The Limits to Growth, possibly because resources have gotten cheaper rather than more expensive and more and more production has moved into the service industry. But mainstream forecasts of long-term GDP growth, a plausible proxy, are positive as far as the eye can see, in sharp contrast to what The Limits to Growth expected. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, for example, the only major group to have set out informed GDP scenarios through 2100, estimates that global GDP per capita will increase 14-fold over the century and increase 24-fold in the developing world.¶ The amount of population growth was somewhat underestimated, mainly because medical advances have reduced death rates even faster than expected (despite the unforeseen HIV/AIDS crisis). But the population growth rate has slowed since the late 1960s, unlike the World3 predictions, because birthrates have fallen along with development.¶ And predictions about the last two factors, agricultural production and pollution, were way off--which is important because these were the two backup drivers of collapse if a scarcity of resources didn't do the job. Global per capita food consumption was expected to increase by more than 50 percent in the four decades after 1970, peak in 2010, and then drop by 70 percent. Calorie availability has **indeed** increased, if not quite so dramatically (by somewhat more than 25 percent), but the collapse of the food supply is nowhere in sight, and there is every reason to believe that the gains will continue and be sustainable. Malnutrition has not been vanquished, and the absolute number of people going hungry has in fact increased slightly recently (in part because some crops have been diverted from food to biofuel production due to concerns about global warming). But over the past 40 years, the fraction of the global population that is malnourished has dropped from 35 percent to less than 16 percent, and well over two billion more people have been fed adequately. The world is nowhere close to hitting a ceiling on the usage of arable land; currently, 3.7 billion acres are being used, and 6.7 billion acres are in reserve. Nor have productivity gains maxed out. The latest long-range UN report on food availability, from 2006, estimated that the world would be able to feed ever-more people, each with evermore calories, out to midcentury.¶ As for its pollution predictions, The Limits to Growth was simultaneously scary and vague. **Pollution's increase was supposed to trigger a global collapse** if the decrease of food or resources didn't do so first, but how exactly pollution was defined was left unclear. Individual pollutants, such as DDT, lead, mercury, and pesticides, were mentioned, **but how those could kill any significant number of people was unspecified**, making it a bit tricky to test the prediction. Air pollution might be considered a good proxy for overall pollution, since it was the biggest environmental killer in the twentieth century and since the Environmental Protection Agency estimates that its regulation produces 86-96 percent of all the social benefits from environmental regulation more generally. In the developing world, outdoor air pollution is indeed rising and killing more people, currently perhaps over 650,000 per year. Indoor air pollution (from using dirty fuels for cooking and heating) kills even more, almost two million per year (although that number has been decreasing slightly).¶ Even in the developed world, outdoor air pollution is still the biggest environmental killer (at least 250,000 dead each year), although environmental regulation has reduced the death toll dramatically over the past half century. Indoor air pollution in the developed world kills almost nobody. Whereas the Club of Rome imagined an idyllic past with no pollution and happy farmers and a future world choked by fumes and poisons from industrialization run amok, the reality is quite different. Over the last century, pollution has neither spiraled out of control nor gotten more deadly, and the risk of death from air pollution is predicted to continue to drop (see Figure 4).

Prefer a) my evidence is backed by history, yours isn’t, means its more likely to be true b) my evidence analyzes yours and explains why its wrong, so its scope is broader

Turn: The transition is impossible, but attempting it causes disaster. Their argument is wishful thinking. **Barnhizer 6[[70]](#footnote-70)**

Some advocates of sustainability think they can slow the world down to a point of elegant stasis. n48 Because such people are invariably humane, I conclude they simply **do not understand** the consequences to human societies and the ordinary residents of those societies that would flow from their positions if the nightmare that they mistake for a dream were accomplished. The naive attitudes underlying such positions are similar to the "deep ecology" movement where nature is accorded only benign intentions. The fact that we inhabit a savage and unheeding natural world in which species consume each other, earthquakes destroy, tsunamis overwhelm, and volcanoes spread ash, creating years without summers, is **conveniently ignored.** Sustainability represents a wide and diverse variety of functions, methods, and values that on many levels are **incompatible**. On the idealized plane this includes the values of ecological, economic, social, and political harmony. These values are used to support an argument in favor of a form of economic and social stasis writ large on the global stage. As an ideal, this form of sustainability stands for such principles as the precautionary principle and embodies the warnings about overuse of resources found in Garrett Hardin's Tragedy of the Commons, the Club of Rome's Limits to Growth, or Lester Brown's Twenty-Ninth Day, where Brown argued that an exponential progression in abuse and overuse of natural resources will generate a catastrophic collapse of systems. n50 These predictions of disaster are well worth heeding, but there are countervailing social disasters that can result if we take too aggressive a stance in our efforts to prevent the ecological harms. These trade-offs include the need to generate wealth sufficient to **sustain** existing **social justice** and equity obligations and the need to create jobs and **opportunities** to alleviate the tragedy of abject poverty and denial of fair opportunity.

Turn: Growth will follow decline – attempts to break free cause environmental devastation **Mead ‘12[[71]](#footnote-71)**

The green movement has been more of a group hug than a curve bending exercise, and that is unlikely to change. If the climate curve bends, it will bend the way the population curve did: as the result of lots of small human decisions driven by short term interest calculations rather than as the result of a grand global plan. The shale boom hasn’t turned green success into green failure. It’s prevented green failure from turning into something much worse. Monbiot understands this better than McKibben; there was never any real doubt that we’d keep going to the liquor store. If we hadn’t found ways to use all this oil and gas, we wouldn’t have embraced the economics of less. True, as oil and gas prices rose, there would be more room for wind and solar power, but the real winner of an oil and gas shortage is… coal. To use McKibben’s metaphor, there is a much dirtier liquor store just down the road from the shale emporium, and it’s one we’ve been patronizing for centuries. The US and China have oodles of coal, and rather than walk to work from our cold and dark houses all winter, we’d use it. Furthermore, when and if the oil runs out, the technology exists to get liquid fuel out of coal. It isn’t cheap and it isn’t clean, but it works. The newly bright oil and gas future means that we aren’t entering a new Age of Coal. For this, every green on the planet should give thanks. The second reason why greens should give thanks for shale is that environmentalism is a luxury good. People must survive and they will survive by any means necessary. But they would much rather thrive than merely survive, and if they can arrange matters better, they will. A poor society near the edge of survival will dump the industrial waste in the river without a second thought. It will burn coal and choke in the resulting smog if it has nothing else to burn. Politics in an age of survival is ugly and practical. It has to be. The best leader is the one who can cut out all the fluff and the folderol and keep you alive through the winter. During the Battle of Leningrad, people burned priceless antiques to stay alive for just one more night. An age of energy shortages and high prices translates into an age of radical food and economic insecurity for billions of people. Those billions of hungry, frightened, angry people won’t fold their hands and meditate **on the ineffable wonders of Gaia and her mystic web of life as they pass peacefully away. Nor will they vote George Monbiot and Bill McKibben into power**. They will butcher every panda in the zoo before they see their children starve, they will torch every forest on earth before they freeze to death, and the cheaper and the meaner their lives are, the less energy or thought they will spare to the perishing world around them. But, thanks to shale and other unconventional energy sources, that isn’t where we are headed. We are heading into a world in which energy is abundant and horizons are open even as humanity’s grasp of science and technology grows more secure. A world where more and more basic human needs are met is a world that has time to think about other goals and the money to spend on them. As China gets richer, the Chinese want cleaner air, cleaner water, purer food — and they are ready and able to pay for them. A Brazil whose economic future is secure can afford to treasure and conserve its rain forests. A Central America where the people are doing all right is more willing and able to preserve its biodiversity. And a world in which people know where their next meal is coming from is a world that can and will take thought for things like the sustainability of the fisheries and the protection of the coral reefs. A world that is more relaxed about the security of its energy sources is going to be able to do more about improving the quality of those sources and about managing the impact of its energy consumption on the global commons. A rich, energy secure world is going to spend more money developing solar power and wind power and other sustainable sources than a poor, hardscrabble one. When human beings think their basic problems are solved, they start looking for more elegant solutions. Once Americans had an industrial and modern economy, we started wanting to clean up the rivers and the air. Once people aren’t worried about getting enough calories every day to survive, they start wanting healthier food more elegantly prepared. A world of abundant shale oil and gas is a world that will start imposing more environmental regulations on shale and gas producers. A prosperous world will set money aside for research and development for new technologies that conserve energy or find it in cleaner surroundings. A prosperous world facing climate change will be able to ameliorate the consequences and take thought for the future in ways that a world overwhelmed by energy insecurity and gripped in a permanent economic crisis of scarcity simply can’t and won’t do..

Prefer a) empirically verified-my author shows this is what’s happened throughout history, means I’m more likely right since history repeats itself b) I control uniqueness-in a world of growth there hasn’t been an economic catastrophe, the only thing that risks changing that is econ collapse.

## Kritik

### Terror Talk

##### Perms:

Perm: Reject the discourse of the AC but still perform the same action of the aff. If the negative discourse surrounding terrorism is the underlying cause then either the harms are solved and there’s a net benefit from the AC off the econ advantage or the alt can’t solve the impacts either.

Perm: Deconstruct our discourse and embrace the dialectical opposition between the AC’s ideology and the K. This kind of analysis is the only possible way of understanding the way the Western gaze is cast upon terrorist groups, so comes before your net benefits.

**Larsen, 2006, prof of Social Sciences at the University of Ottawa, Canada**, [Mike, "Talking About Terrorism:An Analysis Of Official Canadian Insecurity Narratives In The Post-September 11 Context", Internet Journal of Criminology, www.internetjournalofcriminology.com, ----]

Baudrillard (2003) proposes that terrorism is a symbolic act of ‘gift giving’, where the gift of death promotes a reactionary, in-kind response from the state that is attacked. He describes this asymmetrical exchange of violence as ‘The Spirit of Terrorism’ (Baudrillard, 2003). Baudrillard argues that international terrorists have adopted the ‘means’ of Western society (mass media and modern technology), without internalizing the capitalist goals that are associated with these tools. He describes the post-September 11 context as being characterized by ‘terror against terror’, where both the major powers and their enemies are engaged in a nihilistic war that is no longer grounded in specific ideologies (which accounts for some of the difficulty associated with defining the phenomenon). Baudrillard (2003, p. 4) considers the 2001 attacks to be the first major symbolic assault on the hegemonic model of globalization that characterizes the world today. He also proposes that the rapid pace of philosophical and scientific analysis that characterized the pre-September 11 “End of History” context, where the objective was anticipating future trends before they occurred, must be replaced by a careful and introspective approach to making sense of such a ‘high-speed’ event (ibid, p. 4). To Baudrillard, terrorism, at least in its contemporary manifestations, must be considered alongside – and in opposition to – globalization. While globalization represents the movement towards a form of universality, the ethos of global terrorism is one of singularity. Terrorism, he argues, can be seen as the assertion of a violent notion of heterogeneity in the face of this homogenizing globalization (ibid, p. 95). This viewpoint rejects the ‘clash of civilizations’ model of terrorism, proposing an alternative concept based on a clash of universalism vs. singularity. When this thesis is applied by Baudrillard to the symbolic relationships that underpin globalization, an interesting conclusion emerges. He proposes that it is erroneous to think of globalization as a system that takes everything from the cultures it assimilates without giving anything meaningful back (a popular thesis); rather, he argues that we can understand the hatred of fundamentalists for the West as a reaction to a globalization that gives itself (through its universalizing principles and system of cultural equivalence) without allowing the recipients to give anything back (ibid, p. 100). This experience is described by Baudrillard as humiliating, and it follows that the logical response is terrorism, which inflicts humiliation-in-kind. He returns to the discourse on gift and symbolic exchange when he concludes that the unilateral gift of globalization is an act of power, one that leaves no opportunities for reciprocation, leads to cultural humiliation, and in the end, sows the seeds of its own demise (105).

##### Turns:

Turn: A focus on discourse masks the motion of power and how the substantive forces underlying structural violence can adapt to re-emerge in new modalities of discourse. Brown 1[[72]](#footnote-72),

Here, Foucault's concern is less with disrupting the conventional modernist equation of power with speech on one side, and oppression with silence on the other, than with the ways in which insurrectionary discourse borne of exclusion and marginalization can be colonized by that which produced it much as counter-cultural fashion is routinely commodified by the corporate textile industry. While "disqualified" discourses are an effect of domination, they nevertheless potentially function as oppositional when they are deployed by those who inhabit them. However, when "annexed" by those "unitary" discourses which they ostensibly oppose, they become a particularly potent source of regulation, carrying as they do intimate and detailed knowledge of their subjects. Thus, Foucault's worry would appear to adhere not simply to the study of but to the overt political mobilization, of oppositional discourses. Consider the way in which the discourse of multiculturalism has been annexed by mainstream institutions to generate new modalities of essentialized racial discourse

Turn: A refusal to engage in the politics of our discourse enables new modes for combatting oppression—a unilateral focus on our discursive frames limits the oppressed to conventional modes of resistance which are doomed to fail. Brown 2

**Perhaps there are** dead or deadening (anti-life) **things which must be allowed** residence **in the** that **pond of silence rather than surfaced into discourse** if life is to be lived without being claimed by their weight. **Certain experiences**-concentration camp existence or childhood abuse-**may conservatively claim their subjects when those experiences are incessantly remembered in speech**, when survivors can only and always speak of what they almost did not survive and thus cannot break with that threat to live in a present not dominated by it. **And what if this endless speaking** about one's past of suffering **is a means of attempting to excoriate guilt about what one did not do to prevent the suffering**, an attempt which is doomed insofar as the speaking actually perpetuates by disavowing the guilt**?**29 **If to speak repeatedly of a trauma is a mode of encoding it as identity, it may be the case that** drowned **things must be consigned to live in a pond of silence in order to make a world**-a future-**that is other than them.** Put slightly differently by Primo Levi, "**a memory evoked** too often, and **in the form of a story, tends to become fixed in a stereotype . . . crystallized, perfected, adorned, *installing itself in the place of the raw memory and growing at its expense.****"3"* Many feminist **narratives of suffering** would seem to **bear precisely this character**

### Apocolyptic Rhetoric

##### Perms

Perm: Embrace the duality of the destiny of death and the struggle against it by doing the alt and the AC—this is more productive than a mere refusal to humor the deepest parts of our psyche that move us to preserve life. Ricouer,

Now **what happens to** this simple **[the] opposition between desire and reality when it is shifted to** the area of **the new theory of instincts?** This question arises because the first term of the pair, **pleasure, vacilitates in its most basic meaning, and also because reality contains death.** However, **the death that reality holds in reserve is no longer the death instinct, but my own death**, death as a destiny; this is what gives reality its exorable and tragic sense; **because of death-destiny reality is called necessity** and bears the tragic name Ananke. Let us ask ourselves, then, to what extent the oldest theme of Freudianism-that of the double functioning of the psychical apparatus-was raised to the level of the great dramaturgy of Freud’s later writings.

He adds,

It is **only within very** narrow and very **strict limits** that **one may say** that **the “romantic” theme of Eros transformed to the reality principle.** But **this discrepancy between** the relative mythcizing of **Eros and the cold consideration of reality deserves attention** and reflection

Perm: Reject the discourse of the AC but still perform the same action of the aff. If the negative discourse surrounding terrorism is the underlying cause then either the harms are solved and there’s a net benefit from the AC off the econ advantage or the alt can’t solve the impacts either.

Perm: Do the AC and then deconstruct how our views on death—if there’s a shred of moral uncertainty which no framework can eradicate since it’s an existential negative, then it’s better for us to preserve the conditions that allow us to decide whether or not the K’s story is true.

##### Turns:

A focus on discourse masks the motion of power and how the underlying causes behind apocalyptic rhetoric will re-emerge in different modalities of discourse. Brown 1[[73]](#footnote-73),

Here, Foucault's concern is less with disrupting the conventional modernist equation of power with speech on one side, and oppression with silence on the other, than with the ways in which insurrectionary discourse borne of exclusion and marginalization can be colonized by that which produced it much as counter-cultural fashion is routinely commodified by the corporate textile industry. While "disqualified" discourses are an effect of domination, they nevertheless potentially function as oppositional when they are deployed by those who inhabit them. However, when "annexed" by those "unitary" discourses which they ostensibly oppose, they become a particularly potent source of regulation, carrying as they do intimate and detailed knowledge of their subjects. Thus, Foucault's worry would appear to adhere not simply to the study of but to the overt political mobilization, of oppositional discourses. Consider the way in which the discourse of multiculturalism has been annexed by mainstream institutions to generate new modalities of essentialized racial discourse

Structuring the discourse of the round that demands how we are supposed to orient ourselves towards death reproduces a form of exclusion in which our political strategy is only informed by postmodern scholarship.

Rene Francisco Poitevin, Doctoral Candidate in Sociology at UC Davis, member of the SR [Socialist Review], 2001, Socialist Review, “The end of anti-capitalism as we knew it: Reflections on postmodern Marxism,”

First, in the postmodern/post-Marxist world, it is the (white, middleclass) postmodern intellectual who gets constituted as the new "revolutionary subject."40 In a political universe controlled by postmodern Marxist physics, where there are no longer objective mechanisms of oppression, but what matters is "rather how... we wish to think of the complex interaction between these [sic] complexities,"" the postmodern intellectual becomes the de facto new vanguard. In a political practice that denies the possibility of objective criteria in deciding what constitutes social phenomena, postmodern intellectuals are the agency in charge of allocating legitimacy to political claims. It is no longer the material conditions or the historical conjuncture of a particular situation that determine what is to be done, but as JK. Gibson-Graham claim, it is "rather how we wish to think" about social problems that constitutes the defining criteria for validity and politics - in a context where the "we" is constituted by a postmodern intelligentsia. Simply put, it is no longer up to the working class, or queer people of color, or women, or the party intellectual, or any other subjectivity to decide which project is legitimate enough to merit recognition - and commitment. In the postmodern Marxist world, the hypereducated postmodern scholar is the one in charge of leading and defining which struggles count and how they will be fought. Simply put, the postmodern intellectual is the new revolutionary subject. One of the most immediate and important tasks in the postmodern/post-Marxist "revolution" is theory production. To paraphrase Lenin, there can be no revolutionary practice without postmodern theory. The reason that postmodern theory is so important is because, as they themselves put it, postmodern Marxism constructs political agency by offering a "range of subject positions that individuals may inhabit, constituting themselves as class subjects with particular political energies and possibilities."42 This, of course, is no small task given that "the production of new knowledges is a world-changing activity, one that repositions other knowledges and empowers new subjects, practices and institutions."43 This privileging of postmodern-theory production, coupled with the unique role conferred on the postmodern intellectual in a political process that privileges discourse at the expense of institutional analysis constitutes (in an ironic twist of fate for people who are so explicitly anti-Leninist) nothing short of a new vanguardism on post-structuralist steroids.

Outweighs impacts of the K, your kritik makes the same unilateral demand of our orientation towards death you criticize in the AC, but at least I preserve the conditions for people
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